

**PROCESS FOR DETERMINING THE
REMEDIATION CATEGORY OF IHSSS**

IHSS Evaluation Form

EG&G Rocky Flats Inc.

March 24 1994

Volume II

ADMIN RECORD

A 0104 011097

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 102
OU No OU1

OIL SWUDGE PIT

Evaluation Date 2/19/84
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	NO CONT FOUND
Current Environmental Quality	1	NO CONT FOUND
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	NO CONT FOUND
A =	3	

Representativeness of Data	B =	5	LST AMN N DANE
----------------------------	-----	---	----------------

REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	5	SOIL SAMPLING	VERY EASY
Technology	5	SOIL SAMPLING	
Implementability	5	SOIL SAMPLING	
Design/Implementation Schedule	5	ALREADY COMPLETE	
Worker Safety	5	NO RISK	

WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	5	NO WASTE	
Ease of Waste Disposal	5	NO WASTE	

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	5	NO CONTRACTORS NEEDED	
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	SAMPLING EFFORT PERFORMED	

BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	5	FINAL ACTION TAKEN	

ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	5	NO IMPACT	
Other Factors	5	REG NFA	

C = 60

Total Score = A x B x C = 900
(Base score 1000)

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 103
OU No 001

CH_EMICAL BURIAL

Evaluation Date 2/15/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	NO CONT FOUND
Current Environmental Quality	1	NO CONT FOUND
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	NO CONT FOUND
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	B = 5	SOIL SAMPLING PERFORMED
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	SOIL SAMPLING
Technology	5	SOIL SAMPLING
Implementability	5	SOIL SAMPLING
Design/Implementation Schedule	5	COMPLETE
Worker Safety	5	NO RISK
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	5	NO WASTE
Ease of Waste Disposal	5	NO WASTE
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	NO CONTRACTOR
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	ACCEPTED
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	5	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	NO NET IMPACT
Other Factors	5	COMPLETE
C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 104
OU No 1

LIQUID DUMPING

Evaluation Date 2/15/91
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	NO CONT FOUND
Current Environmental Quality	1	NO CCN FOUND
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	NO CCN FOUND
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	5	SILICATE DUMPING
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	SOIL SAMPLING
Technology	5	SOIL SAMPLING
Implementability	5	SOIL SAMPLING
Design/Implementation Schedule	5	COMPLETE
Worker Safety	5	NO RISK
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	5	NO WASTE
Ease of Waste Disposal	5	NO WASTE
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	NO CONTRACTORS
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	ACCEPTED
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	5	YES
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	NO IMPACT
Other Factors	5	COMPLETE
C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 105 (142)
OU No 1

OUT-OF-SERVICE FUEL TANKS

Evaluation Date 2/5/79
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential <input type="radio"/> High Potential		
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality <input type="radio"/> Poor Quality		
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential <input type="radio"/> High Potential		
	A =		
Representativeness of Data	<input type="radio"/> Incomplete <input checked="" type="radio"/> Partial <input type="radio"/> Complete		
	B =		
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific <input type="radio"/> Very Flexible		
Technology	<input type="radio"/> Ready Now <input checked="" type="radio"/> "On the Shelf"		
Implementability	Easy Implementation <input type="radio"/> No Obstacles		
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead <input type="radio"/> Short-Lead		
Worker Safety	<input type="radio"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="radio"/> Low Risk to Worker		
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="radio"/> High Volume of Waste <input checked="" type="radio"/> Low Volume of Waste		
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="radio"/> Two Options <input checked="" type="radio"/> No Options		
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="radio"/> Not Cooperative <input checked="" type="radio"/> Very Cooperative		
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="radio"/> Not Well-Accepted <input checked="" type="radio"/> Fully Accepted		
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes		
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="radio"/> Lesser Negative Impact <input checked="" type="radio"/> Lesser No Negative Impact		
Other Factors	<input type="radio"/> Major Hazardous <input checked="" type="radio"/> Minor Hazardous		
	C =		

ARE THESE STILL THERE? (yes)

HAS UNDERLYING SOIL BEEN SAMPLED? (no)

Total Score = A x B x C = _____

WERE DOWNTREAT SOIL/CW POTS SAMPLED? (no)

Check w/ Zeks

IHSS No 106
OU No 1

IHSS Evaluation Form

OUTFALL

Evaluation Date 2/15/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1 Low Potential 5 High Potential	REINFORCED
Current Environmental Quality	1 Poor Quality 5 Good Quality	REINFORCED
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1 Low Potential 5 High Potential	REINFORCED
	A = 3	
Representativeness of Data	B = 5	same area
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	1 Very Inflexible 5 Very Flexible	REINFORCED
Technology	1 Most Expensive 5 Most Economical	5
Implementability	1 Very Difficult 5 No Difficulties	5
Design/Implementation Schedule	1 Long Lead 5 Short Lead	5
Worker Safety	1 Risk to Worker 5 Low Risk to Worker	5
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	1 High Volume of Waste 5 Low Volume of Waste	5
Ease of Waste Disposal	1 Very Difficult 5 No Difficulties	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1 Non-Union 5 Union Workers	5
Public and Agency Acceptability	1 Not Well-Accepted 5 Fully Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1 No 5 Yes	5
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	1 Causes Negative Impact 5 Causes No Negative Impact	5
Other Factors	1 Poor Management 5 Good Management	5
	C = 60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 107
OU No 1

BIG BOS HILLSIDE OIL LEAK

Evaluation Date 2/15/74
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Low Potential <input type="radio"/> High Potential	1	RELEVANT TO S
Current Environmental Quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Good Quality <input type="radio"/> Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Low Potential <input type="radio"/> High Potential	1	
	A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Excellent <input type="radio"/> Fair <input type="radio"/> Poor	5	
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Very Site-Specific <input type="radio"/> Very Flexible	5	
Technology	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Proven and Well-Understood <input type="radio"/> New or Unproven	5	
Implementability	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Many Options <input type="radio"/> No Options	-	1
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Long Lead <input type="radio"/> Short Lead	4	
Worker Safety	<input checked="" type="radio"/> High Risk to Worker <input type="radio"/> Low Risk to Worker		
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input checked="" type="radio"/> High Volume of Waste <input type="radio"/> Low Volume of Waste	5	
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Very Difficult <input type="radio"/> No Waste	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input checked="" type="radio"/> High Work-Demand <input type="radio"/> Low Work-Demand	5	1
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Poor Acceptability <input type="radio"/> Fully Acceptable	5	1
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	5	1
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Lesser Negative Impact <input type="radio"/> Greater No Negative Impact	5	
Other Factors	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Major Factor <input type="radio"/> Minor Factor	5	1
	C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1191
OU No 1

WEST SCRAP METAL SOURCE AREA

Evaluation Date 2/15/94
Evaluators MKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	2	REL LOW
Current Environmental Quality	3	CW - CW
Potential for Contaminant Migration	2	ENR CONTROLS TO MITIGATE CW MIGRATION
A =	27	
Representativeness of Data	5	CW GOL DATA - TPD
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	REMOVED IN A PACE
Technology	5	
Implementability	5	
Design/Implementation Schedule	5	
Worker Safety	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	4	PART OF F DRAIN SYSTEM
Ease of Waste Disposal	4	PART OF F DRAIN SYSTEM
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	REFERS OPERATING REM SYSTEM
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	REMOVED AT ON SYSTEM IN PROCESS
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	5	HIGH LIKELIHOOD
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	WHEN REM IS COMPLETE
Other Factors	5	IN PROGRESS
C =	52 5? 6	

NKDS VERIFIED AND

Total Score = A x B x C = 2660

1855 20¹⁰

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 119 2
 OU No 1

EST SCRAP METAL STO AREA

Evaluation Date 21-15-94
 Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	No CON- Same score
Current Environmental Quality	1	No CON- as 119 1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	No CON-
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	5	> L SAMPLED - N/V
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	SOIL SAMPLING
Technology	5	
Implementability	5	
Design/Implementation Schedule	5	COMPLETE
Worker Safety	5	NO CON-
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	5	COMPLETE
Ease of Waste Disposal	5	NO WASTE
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	NO CONTRACTORS
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	COMPLETE
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	5	COMPLETE
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	COMPLETE
Other Factors	5	IN PROGRESS
C =	60	

NETS VALIDATION

1855-

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 130
OU No Y 21

CONE Soil Disp Area

Evaluation Date 2/15/94

Evaluators AHS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	NO SURF HAZ?
Current Environmental Quality	3	NOT PESTICIDE?
Potential for Contaminant Migration	3	CONC SOIL?
A =	7	
Representativeness of Data	5	SUR/CD S NC - JEW
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	2	SL -> TO 'PARK' PU challenge
Technology	1	
Implementability	1	UNKNOWN MPC
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	
Worker Safety	5	NO SURF LNT
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	IF CAPPED UNKNOWN CLEAN UP PLAN
Ease of Waste Disposal	2	IF CAPPED PW
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	3	12164T?
Public and Agency Acceptability	1	IF CAPPING PW STUFF STILL THERE
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	5	IF CAPPED Post-Closure Care?
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	3	NOT PESTICIDE
Other Factors	1	EASY TO DO
NEEDS CAPTION	C = <u>5</u> 28	

Total Score = A x B x C = 5 100 980

DEPER

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 145
OU No 1

SANITARY WASTE USE LEAK

Evaluation Date 2/15/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	LOWEST A 761D
Current Environmental Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	5	COL 1 - 100%
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	REMEDIAL 100%
Technology	5	
Implementability	5	0
Design/implementation Schedule	5	
Worker Safety	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	5	
Ease of Waste Disposal	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	11
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	5	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	11
Other Factors	5	0
C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 108
OU No 2

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators HVS

Trench T-1

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	4	Shallow burial but covered
Current Environmental Quality	5	Waste in pit
Potential for Contaminant Migration	5/4	No Eng. controls
A =	<u>5/13</u>	
Representativeness of Data	B = 5	S _c = n/a
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	3	Wain
Technology	3	need to -tachise
Implementability	3	Technically achievable
Design/Implementation Schedule	3	" "
Worker Safety	X 2	Will w/ no controls
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3/1	Waste & soil
Ease of Waste Disposal	2	Weld, ground, etc.
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1	Likely?
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	Motivation for excavating waste
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	5/4	removal
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5/4	Removal (soil) remediation
Other Factors	5/3	Should be high priority
C =	<u>5/38</u>	<u>-340</u> <u>-2730</u>

Total Score = A x B x C = 2145

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 109
OU No 2

TRENCH T 2

Evaluation Date 2/14/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	2	LOW NOT PRISTINE
Current Environmental Quality	3	NOT PRISTINE
Potential for Contaminant Migration	3	LNL RUN OFF INTO SWEEP DRAIN
A =	9	
Representativeness of Data	5	TO 100% SWEEPING - - -
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	NO SOIL
Technology	5	
Implementability	3	PP 100% TO 155 (LARGE)
Design/Implementation Schedule	3	MEDIUM
Worker Safety	4/2	NOT PRISTINE NO VOCs IN RAD AREA
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3/1	MEDIUM HIGH
Ease of Waste Disposal	4/2	SMALL HAZ MW
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1	PROBABLY 7
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	MOTIVATION TO DO ACTION
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	3/4	DEP ON REMEDIATION OF 155
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	8/3	REMEDIATION
Other Factors	3	DEP ON REMEDIATION OF 155
C =	44 34	1440

Total Score = A x B x C = 1760

NO TRENCH VERT F1 AT SW

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 110
OU No 2

TRENCH T3

Evaluation Date 2/14/PA
Evaluators MKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	X 2	BURIED
Current Environmental Quality	Poor Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good Quality	3	NOT PRISTINE - MUST BE REM ED
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	3 5	NOT PRESENT NAPL
A =	7 7		

Representativeness of Data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	B =	5 - -5
----------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----	--------

REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Flexible	5	50% - -?
Technology	Needs New Tech. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Off the Shelf	5	
Implementability	Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles	4	10% - 70% RE AC
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short Lead	X 3	MODERATE
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to Worker	4 3	NOT PRESENT HIGH VOCs

WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of Waste	7 1	NOT PRESENT HIGH
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Waste	3 2	Possibly NW

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	High Concentration <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Workers	1	PROBABLY ?
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy Accepted	5	NOT VARIOUS TO REMOVE WASTE

BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	5 3	REMOVES Could have GW cont

ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Creates No Negative Impact	5 4	IF REM ED
Other Factors	Major Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor Impact	5	SHOULD CROWD UP IMPACT IN PLACE

RESULTS INDICATION C = 49 41 EMERGENCY ACTION -

Total Score = A x B x C = 775 1845

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 111 2-1116
 OU No 2

EAST TRUCKS S OF RD

Evaluation Date 2/22/94
 Evaluators AKS/PL

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	2
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	3
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
	A =	6
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	B = 5
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Short-Term Very Flexible	5
Technology	Needs New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	4
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	3
Worker Safety	Slow to Improve Low Risk to Worker	3
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	1
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Hazardous No Waste	2 MW
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Commitment Low Commitment	1
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Respected Fully Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	Yes No	3
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact	4
Other Factors	Other Considerations Additional Assessment	1
	C =	37

Total Score = A x B x C = 1110

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1111,1117

OU No 2 EAST TRENCHES ~~TOP R GR~~
N SIDE OF RD

Evaluation Date 2/15/91
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	• Low Potential High Potential	3 2
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	5 3
Potential for Contaminant Migration	• Low Potential High Potential	4
A =	<u>129</u>	
Representativeness of Data	• Representative No Representative	B = <u>—</u> 5
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	• Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	3 5
Technology	• Needs New Tools "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	• Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5 4
Design/Implementation Schedule	• Long Term Short-Term	3
Worker Safety	• Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	3
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	• High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	1
Ease of Waste Disposal	• TRU Mixed No Waste	1 2
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	• Not Cooperative Cooperative	1
Public and Agency Acceptability	• Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	• No Yes	5 3
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	• Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5 4
Other Factors	• Other Remediation Alternative Remediation	5 4
C =	<u>42 40</u>	
NEEDS VARIATION		

Total Score = A x B x C = 2520

1000

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 112
OU No 2

903 PAD

Evaluation Date 2/15/91
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	8 2 <i>AS IT STANDS CAPPED</i>
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	5 <i>Pu under pad</i>
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 <i>CAPPED</i>
A =	<u>1.08</u>	
Representativeness of Data	B =	~ 20 25 1/4
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5 3 <i>pu - art - pu issues</i>
Technology	From New York "Off the Shelf"	3 <i>MEDIAN</i>
Implementability	Many Options No Options	3 <i>MEDIAN</i>
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	3 <i>MEDIAN</i>
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	+ 3 <i>Pu-risk, low future cap -</i>
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5 3 <i>22 - pu - median</i>
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Mixed No Waste	8 1 <i>nonradioactive - TRU-mixed</i>
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	50% Consistent 50% Variable	5 3 <i>irreconcilable mix</i>
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not well-Received Fully Accepted	+ 3 <i>un-needed coexisting method</i>
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	+ 3 <i>may need post-closure care</i>
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Lower Negative Impact Lower No Negative Impact	+ 3 <i>bad scene</i>
Other Factors	Other Ameliorative Ameliorative Ameliorative	3 1 <i>no need to worry for DFCR</i>
C =	<u>30.32</u>	<u>1280</u> <u>1980</u>

Total Score = A x B x C = 1980

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 113
OU No 2

MOUND

Evaluation Date 2/15/91
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 <i>BURIED</i>
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	5 <i>VOLCS IN SOIL</i>
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	3 1 <i>33 yrs to mig b NOT COING ANYWHERE</i>
A =	8 7	
Representativeness of Data	B =	8 4 <i>PSZ SAMPLED, MTR 144</i>
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Possible	3 <i>SVE?</i>
Technology	Needs New Tools "Off the Shelf"	3 5 <i>METHOD</i>
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	1 <i>PSZ</i>
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	3 1 <i>METHOD FENCE ISSUES</i>
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	5 <i>REMOTE = SVF</i>
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	4 <i>ANCILLARY TO PROCESS</i>
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRUE Hazard No Hazard	4 <i>SIMPLIEST HAZ</i>
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Concern Low Concern	1 <i>PROBABLY</i>
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	5 <i>CLEAN UP</i>
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5 <i>PROBABLY</i>
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Large Negative Impact Large No Negative Impact	8 4 <i>IF REMOVED</i>
Other Factors	Major Environmental Minor Environmental	1 <i>DEFER UNTL PSZ IS REMOVED/MOVED</i>
C =	4Q 39	

Total Score = A x B x C = 1000 **1092**

IHSS No 140
OU No 2

IHSS Evaluation Form

HAZARDOUS DISPOSAL SITE

Evaluation Date 2/15/79
Evaluators MKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	LITHIUM METAL
Current Environmental Quality	1	DUE TO MO
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	B = 5	SOIL COMPOUND
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	CONFIRMATION SAMPLING
Technology	5	
Implementability	1	155 (LIP AREA)
Design/Implementation Schedule	5	SOIL SAMPLING
Worker Safety	+2	DUE TO 155
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	5	NO WASTE
Ease of Waste Disposal	5	NO WASTE
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	LIZZIE ACTION
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	OFF BOOKS
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	155 ACTIVITIES
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	DUE TO MO
Other Factors	3 1	DO WITH 155
C =	46.45	

Total Score = A x B x C = 675 / 690

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 153
OU No 2

OIL BURN PIT #2

Evaluation Date 2/14/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS		SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	Burn = -
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	3	VOCs + SO2
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	3/2	VOCs S
A =		96	
Representativeness of Data		B = 2	22 + 27
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	3	
Technology	Needs New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	2	
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	1	
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	3/1	SAME AS 113
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	4	
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Waste	4	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	100% Communion 50% Workers	1	
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	5	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5	
Other Factors	1 Other Information Additional Information	1	
C =		70 34	

CANNOT BE DISTINGUISHED

BY 113

Total Score = A x B x C = 560 648

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 154
OU No 2

PAULY BURN SITE

Evaluation Date 2/15/94
Evaluators AIGS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 NO CONT
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1 x 3 NO CONT
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 NO CONT
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Imperfection Perfect	B = 5 DUL DEM LEQ
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5 No Cont
Technology	Needs New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	5 / 1 in PSZ
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5 No waste
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	MTB Cooperative MTB Unfriendly	5 NO CONT
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	5 " "
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5 "
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5 "
Other Factors	Other Remediation Accurate Remediation	5 / 1 " " in PSZ
C =	80 52	

Total Score = A x B x C = 800 780

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 155
OU No 2

LIP AREA
(= American area)

Evaluation Date 2/15/81
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	5 CORD LED OFF
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	3 PU IN SLOPES + STARLIE?
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	3 2 SOME POTENTIAL, LOW
A =	10	
Representativeness of Data	Insufficient adequate	B = SUL SAM UNC
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	3 1 MEDIAN P ISSUES
Technology	Needs New Tools, "Off the Shelf"	3 MEDIAN
Implementability	Many Options No Options	3 1 SOMETHING ELSE NOT TECH & REL'
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short Lead	3 MEDIAN
Worker Safety	Risk to worker Low Risk to worker	4 3 SOIL DISTURBANCE
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High volume of waste Low volume of waste	5 1 IF SOIL STAB - NO
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Mixed No waste	5 1 NO NEED
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	MFB Contractor MFP contractor	5 1 SMALL COMM
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not well-Received Fully Accepted	1 PU + SUL - BAD
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	3 5 NEEDS POST CLOSURE CARE
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	1 PU IN SLOPES
Other Factors	Destroys Environment Accelerates Remediation	1 NO NEED TO ACCELERATE
C =	36 22	

Total Score = A x B x C = 1980 / 100

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 183
OU No 2

GAS DETOX

Evaluation Date 2/15/91
Evaluators AICs

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 GAS EXP TO ATM 20 yrs ago
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1 DUE TO 183
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Impressive Somewhat Impressive	B = < C G U NQ
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5
Technology	Needs New Tools, "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Many barriers No Obstacles	1
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	5 SAME AS 140
Worker Safety	Risk to other Low Risk to other	1 32
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High volume of waste Low volume of waste	5
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	NTB Concerned NTP concerns	5
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5
Other Factors	Major Contribution Minor Contribution	2 1
C =	46 49 45	675 670 720

Total Score = A x B x C = _____

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 216 243
OU No 2

EAST SPRAY FIELDS

Evaluation Date 2/15/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 NO CONT
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1 NO CONT
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 NO CONT
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Inadequate Sufficient	B = 5 - AM C ~
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5 NO CONT
Technology	Needs New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	5
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	HES Concerned HES Unconcerned	5
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not well-Received Fully Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5
Other Factors	Under Amelioration Ameliorate Remediation	5
C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS No 198 199
 OU No 3

IHSS Evaluation Form

LAND SURFACE

Evaluation Date 2/22/94
 Evaluators Ares

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	In Progress
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1	
A =		3	
Representativeness of Data	Acceptable Performance	5	
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5	
Technology	Needs New Tools "Off the Shelf"	5	
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5	
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short Lead	5	
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5	
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No waste	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	100% Community 0% Off Workers	5	
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	5	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Lower Negative Impact Lower No Negative Impact	5	
Other Factors	Minor Implications Major Implications	5	
C =		40	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 700
OU No 3

Great Western

Evaluation Date 2/21/94
Evaluators AK

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	In Progress
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderate Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	
	A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Unrepresentative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Representative	5	
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Difficult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Possible	5	
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs New Tools <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> "Off the Shelf"	5	
Implementability	<input type="checkbox"/> Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles	1	
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Long Lead <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short Lead	5	
Worker Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to Worker	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> High Volume of Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of Waste	5	
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Difficult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Waste	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Cooperative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Cooperative	5	
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well-Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fully Accepted	5	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	5	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Causes Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Causes No Negative Impact	5	
Other Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Causes Environmental Degradation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Causes Environmental Improvement	5	
	C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 261
OU No 3

STANLEY

Evaluation Date 2/22/94
Evaluators MCT

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	
Current Environmental Quality	Good Quality Poor Quality	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	1
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Slow-Change Very Flexible	5
Technology	Needs New Tools "Off the Shelf"	6
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	6
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long-Loss Short-Loss	5
Worker Safety	High Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	6
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Problem	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	Very Unfriendly Very Friendly	5
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact	5
Other Factors	Other Issues Administrative Issues	6
C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS No 202
OU No 043

IHSS Evaluation Form

Evaluation Date 2/22/98
Evaluators ACG

MOWER RESERVOIR

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 <i>In process</i>
Current Environmental Quality	Good Quality Poor Quality	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Excellent Sufficient	B = 5
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Good Very Poor	5
Technology	Modern Tech. "off the shelf"	5
Implementability	Easy No Change	5
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short Lead	5
Worker Safety	Risk to worker Low Risk to worker	5
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Eased No waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	MPS Cooperative MPS Virtuous	5
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Policy Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	• =	5
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Lesser Negative Impact = Lesser No Negative Impact	5
Other Factors	Greater Responsibility = Moderate Responsibility	5
C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 01
OU No 4

SOLAR PONDS

Evaluation Date 2/15/94
Evaluators AHS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	5 DON'T WALK ACROSS THEM
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	5 NOT PRISTINE
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 CANNOT
A =	11	
Representativeness of Data	INADEQUATE SUFFICIENT	B = 5 CAN TELL NO DATA
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	3 MEDIAN
Technology	Needs New Tools, "Out of Sheet"	3 MEDIAN
Implementability	Heavy Obstacles No Obstacles	3 MEDIAN
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	5 IN PROGRESS
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	1 CPUND - 2/17
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	1 IN PROGRESS
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No waste	2 PONDCAST
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	NEW Committed NOT Committed	1 LOOSE
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	5 LET IT DONE
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1 FIRST CLOSURE CALLED
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Lesser Negative Impact Larger No Negative Impact	1 IF CHARGED
Other Factors	Other Impacts Additional Assessment	5 IN PROGRESS
C =	31	

Total Score = A x B x C = 1705

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 115
OU No 5

ORIGINAL LANDFILL

Evaluation Date 2/15/94
Evaluators HCC

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential <small>Low Potential High Potential</small>	1	SANITARY GE
Current Environmental Quality <small>Acceptable Quality Poor Quality</small>	3	NOT PESTICIDE
Potential for Contaminant Migration <small>Low Potential High Potential</small>	X 2	MIGRATION
A =	<u>5 6</u>	
Representativeness of Data <small>Unrepresentative Representative</small>	B = 5	SOLI - 11W - X
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility <small>Very Site-Specific Very Flexible</small>	5	CAP?
Technology <small>Needs New Tools, "Off the Shelf"</small>	5	
Implementability <small>Many Obstacles No Obstacles</small>	X 4	-1" BUFFER ZONE
Design/Implementation Schedule <small>Long Term Short-Term</small>	X 4	
Worker Safety <small>Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker</small>	X 4	
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation <small>High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste</small>	5	NO WASTE
Ease of Waste Disposal <small>TRUE No</small>	X 5	NO WASTE
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force <small>High Commitment Low Commitment</small>	X 3	REBACCT MIX
Public and Agency Acceptability <small>Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted</small>	4	OK
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution <small>Yes No</small>	3	POST-CLOSURE CARE
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact <small>Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact</small>	3	NOT MIGRATE
Other Factors <small>Other Information</small>	5	SHOULD BE EASY - HIGHLY FAVORABLE
C =	<u>X 50</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 125 / 1500

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 196
OU No 16/5

BACKWASH POND

Evaluation Date 2/22/94
Evaluators AICS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	Same as 115
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	3	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1	
		A =	5
Representativeness of Data	Incomplete Incomplete	B =	5
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5	
Technology	Needs New Tools, "Off the Shelf"	5	
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5	
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Lived	5	
Worker Safety	Risks to Worker Low Risks to Worker	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5	
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No waste	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	MTB Coordinator S ETP Workers	1	
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not well-Received Fully Accepted	4	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	3	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact	3	
Other Factors	Deter Determination Acceptable Determination	5	
		C =	5-1

Total Score = A x B x C = 1225 ¹⁵⁰⁰

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1331 1334, 1335
 OU No 5

ASH PITS & INCINERATOR

Evaluation Date 2/15/94
 Evaluators AHS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 <i>BURIED</i>
Current Environmental Quality	Appropriate Quality Poor Quality	2 <i>NOT PRISTINE</i>
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 <i>DU MNGT</i>
A =	4	
Representativeness of Data	Incomplete Incomplete	B = < 100 1/1
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5 <i>CONT SAMPLING ? MAUNG CAP</i>
Technology	Needs New Tools Off the Shelf	5 <i>NO CONT</i>
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	4 <i>REGULATORY</i>
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short Lead	5 <i>NO CONT</i>
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5 <i>NO CONT</i>
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	5 <i>NO WASTE</i>
Ease of Waste Disposal	Few Risks No Risks	< <i>NO WASTE</i>
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	Very Concerned Very Worried	5 <i>PROBABLY</i>
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	8 4 <i>NEED CONCNS</i>
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	3 <i>MAY NEED POST CLOSURE CARE</i>
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	X 3 <i>NET IMPACT</i>
Other Factors	Other Assessments Assessments	5 <i>GASy</i>
C =	4 5 0	LOW

Total Score = A x B x C = 100 70%

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1336
OU No 5

CONCRETE PAD

Evaluation Date 2/15/74
Evaluators AIC

EVALUATION FACTORS		SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	NO CONT
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1	
		A = <u>3</u>	
Representativeness of Data	<u>Unrepresentative</u> <u>Representative</u>	B = <u>5</u>	S - L / SOIL GAS
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5	NO CONT
Technology	Needs New Tools "Off the Shelf"	5	
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5	
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short Lead	5	
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5	NO WASTE
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No waste	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	NTB Cooperative NTB Adversary	5	NO CONT
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Policy Accepted	5	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5	NO CONT
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Lower Negative Impact Higher No Negative Impact	4 5	CONCRETE
Other Factors	Other Adversary Other Non-Adversary	5	NO CONT
C = <u>3 5 2 60</u>			

Total Score = A x B x C = 285 900
NFA

IHSS No 142 10, 11
 OU No 5

IHSS Evaluation Form

C-SERIES DRAINAGE

Evaluation Date 2/15/94
 Evaluators AJAS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Representative Inconclusive	B = 5
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	1
Technology	Needs New Tools, "Off the Shelf"	3
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	1
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	1
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	4
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	1
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRUE Disposal No disposal	X 3
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	WTF Cooperative WTF Unfriendly	1
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	• •	5
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Lesser Negative Impact Larger Negative Impact	3
Other Factors	Major Environmental Minor Environmental	1
C =	30.29	435

NEED VERIFICATION

GUT INSTINCT ONLY

Total Score = A x B x C = 450

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 209
OU No 5

SURFACE DISTURBANCE

Evaluation Date 2/15/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 No Cont
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 "
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Excellent Sufficient	B = 5 Sampling
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Short-Sighted Very Flexible	5 No Cont
Technology	Needs New Tools, "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	5 "
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5 "
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	5 No Waste
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	50% Community & 50% Workers	5 No Cont
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	5 "
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5 "
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5 No Cont
Other Factors	Major Implications Minor Implications	5 Lazy
C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 41
OU No 1

SLUDGE DR PER AL AREA

Evaluation Date 2/15/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 No cont
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1 No cont
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	2 RUSTY & SCA > ST?
A =	4	
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	B = 5 SOIL, W/WT ~ --
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5 CONFIRMATORY SAMPLING PROB
Technology	Needs New Tech. "off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	X 2 CANT DO OFF BOOKS UTC BEDS CONC?
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short Lead	X 2 --
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	4
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5 Confirmation Sampling
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Commitment Low Commitment	5 --
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	3 PR Prob? (Pw)
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	3 Under Beds?
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5 no impact
Other Factors	Debtors' Responsibilities Assumeors' Responsibilities	X 1 no impact either way
C =	5 X 4	

No 1) & infestation

Total Score = A x B x C = 1080 / 900

1 NFR

IHSS No 142 (except lot 11)
OU No 6

IHSS Evaluation Form

DRAINAGE PONDS

Evaluation Date 2/16/94
Evaluators MKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 IN ACCESSIBLE
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	2 SEDIMENTS?
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	2 SPILL OVER?
A =	5	
Representativeness of Data	Insufficient adequate	B = 5 SAMPLING → 1
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Short-Sighted Very Flexible	3 MEDIAN
Technology	Needs New Tools, "Off the Shelf"	3 MEDIAN
Implementability	Very Difficult No Obstacles	1 IN USE
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	1 IN USE
Worker Safety	Risk to worker Low Risk to worker	4 SETIMENT DISTURBANCE
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	3 1 MEDIAN
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Mixed No mix	3 NO BAD STUFF All, Pu
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	NEED Commitment NEP Verdict	1 NEED CORPS INVOLVEMENT TO ALTER?
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	1 NEED ON SITE WACER CONCERN
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1 IN USE NEED SPCC/BMP
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5 P MDS
Other Factors	Other Assessment Additional Assessment	1 DEER
C =	28 25	

Total Score = A x B x C = 700 625

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1A3
OU No 6

771 OUTFALL

Evaluation Date 2/16/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 REMEDIAZED IN 1980
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	X 3 PRINC COST
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 NO CONT
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Instrument Method	B = 5 COL SMC, NG
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Sensitive Very Flexible	5 NO CONT
Technology	Needs New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Very Challenging No Challenges	5 1 IN PA/UVLS/ACRA IN USE
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	5 2 1 4
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5 4 SOL/Redistancia
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	1 4 No waste warrable
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRUE Disposal No Disposal	5 2 1 MW
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	Not Well-Respected Satisfactory	5 No cont
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Respected Fully Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	2	5 "
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5 1
Other Factors	Other Considerations	5 1 Already remediated before till DPT of 771
C =	52 49	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900 660

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1562
OU No ATCEvaluation Date 2/8/84
Evaluators ACS

Soil Dump Area

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	Appreciable
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1	
A =	3		
Representativeness of Data	B =	5	
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Slow-Spiraling Very Flexible	5	
Technology	Needs New Tools, "Off the Shelf"	5	
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5	
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	5	
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5	
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No Waste	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	High Commitment Low Commitment	5	
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	5	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	Yes No	5	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Large Negative Impact Large No Negative Impact	5	
Other Factors	Other Environmental Aspects	5	
C =	40		

Total Score = A x B x C = 901

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 164
OU No 6

TRIANGLE AREA

Evaluation Date 2/16/94
Evaluators AWS

EVALUATION FACTORS		SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	No suff cont
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	2	-
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	2	Per Regressus m?
A =		AS	
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	5	Soil/rock -> soil/gas
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	4	put Do in 5 hrs if?
Technology	Needs New Tech. "off the shelf"	5	Soil removal?
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	3	Site read, strong for OVA
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short Lead	1	for math ad
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	4	Could be suspension
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5	If a /
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRUE Mixed No waste	4	if any
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	50% Communion 0% CCP Workers	5	Probab
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not well-Received Partly Accepted	5	if clean - closed
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No	3	Per to SEPs may lead to recent-
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact	4	possible? & robust?
Other Factors	Other Environmental Non-Environmental	3	wait till SEPs are done?
C =		50	

Total Score = A x B x C = 1250 ~~1000~~

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 166
OU No 6

LF TRENCHES

Evaluation Date 2/16/91
Evaluators MES

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 <i>Appropriated</i>
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Insufficient Sufficient	B = 5
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5
Technology	Needs New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Very Challenging No Challenges	5
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	5
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Commitment Low Commitment	5
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5
Other Factors	Other Environmental Aspects Administrative Aspects	5
C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1671
OU No 6

NORTH LF SPRAT AREA

Evaluation Date 2/18/99
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 No Cont
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =	2	
Representativeness of Data	Good Fair Poor	5 : S & SAN PLUR
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Any Location	5 Soil sampling
Technology	Needs New York, "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	5
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	5 11
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5 No waste?
Ease of Waste Disposal	TEU Required No waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	NTB Compliant NTB Violator	5 Sampling
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	5 11
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5 Right?
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5
Other Factors	Other Assessment Assessment	5
C =	60	

No LSC verification

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1462
OU No 6

Soil Disposal Area

Evaluation Date 2/23/91
Evaluators MCS/EM

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Incomplete adequate	5
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5
Technology	Needs New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	1
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short Lead	5
Worker Safety	High Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Mixed No waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	HTB Cooperative HTB Unions	5
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5
Other Factors	Under Development Incomplete Information	5
C =	00	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 2161
 OU No 6

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
 Evaluators NJS

EAST SPRAY FIELD

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =	<u>3</u>	
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	B = <u>5</u>
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Poor-Governor Very Good-Governor	<u>5</u>
Technology	Needs New Tools "Off the Shelf"	<u>5</u>
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	<u>5</u>
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	<u>5</u>
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	<u>5</u>
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	<u>5</u>
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Mixed No waste	<u>5</u>
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	NTB Conservative NTB Supportive	<u>5</u>
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Policy Accepted	<u>5</u>
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	<u>5</u>
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	<u>5</u>
Other Factors	Minor Assessment Major Assessment	<u>5</u>
C =	<u>60</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 114
OU No 7Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AES

LANDFILL

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	3 LF not on site
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	5 LF - ~ ~
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	3 Controlled
A =	11	
Representativeness of Data	A = <u>5</u>	lots of conflictive data
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	1
Technology	Needs New Tech. "off the shelf"	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	1 IN USE
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	5 IN PROGRESS
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5 NA
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRUE Mixed No Waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	NOT Discriminatory NFP Workers	3 BOTH
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully accepted	5 ACTION
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	-	5 will need post closure care but no other option
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact	1 BY Def
Other Factors	Other Environmental Assessments	5 IN Progress
C =	47	

Total Score = A x B x C = 2585

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 167 243
OU No 7

LF SPRAY ARCS

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators KC

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	X 3
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	X 5
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	X 3
	A =	3
Representativeness of Data	B =	5
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	
Technology	Needs New Tools, "Out of the Box"	5
Implementability	Easy Implementation No Obstacles	1
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	5
Worker Safety	High Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	5
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Simple No Waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Commitment Low Turnover	3
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Respected Fully Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	1
Other Factors	Other Environmental Non-Environmental	5
	C =	47

Total Score = A x B x C = 2585

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 203
OU No 7

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

^{WST}
INACTIVE HAZ SIT AREA

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	No-Cont
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1	"
A =	3		
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	5	Soil / RW sample
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Inflexible Very Flexible	5	Needs Coal Sampling
Technology	Needs New Tools "Off the Shelf"	5	
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5	
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	5	
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5	
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Mixed No waste	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	Not Cooperative Coop Workers	5	
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	5	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	Yes No	5	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5	✓
Other Factors	Doesn't Consider Considers	5	RCRA - UNIT - NEEDS Closure
C =	10		

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 118 1
OU No 9

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AWS

Solvent Spills w/ f 730
(CCW TANK)

EVALUATION FACTORS		SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	sbs fire - TK CONC
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	3	WILLOW UNTIL SOIL SAMPLING
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	3	
		A = <u>7</u>	
Representativeness of Data	Excellent Sufficient	B = <u>4</u>	NEED ADDL SAMPLING
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Short-Term Very Flexible	5	CAPPING
Technology	New Tech. "out the door"	5	
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	3	UTIL IN PA
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	3	
Worker Safety	Safe to Worker Low Safe to Worker	5	Used CCA w/ SIL
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	3	MEDIAN
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Hazardous No hazard	4	straight HAZ
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	80% Committment APP Workers	3	MIX
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	5	ACTION
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	3	IN PA NEAR BLD OTHER IHSS
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Lesser Negative Impact Greater Negative Impact	5	DUE TO 118 1
Other Factors	Other Considerations Assessments Considerations	5	REC FOR SOILS IM/EN
		C = <u>49</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 1372

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1182
OU No 8

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AWS

BLC 776 Solvent Sp (1)

(current CCLa TC)

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	2	Sp 16d VOC
Current Environmental Quality	2	Conf sampling
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	Volatile s fac sp 16
A =	5	
Representativeness of Data	B = 4	Con - 1 c
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	Conf Sampling
Technology	5	
Implementability	2	PA UTILS / IN USE
Design/Implementation Schedule	3	1 use
Worker Safety	4	ROUTINE
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	4	probable
Ease of Waste Disposal	4	5+ a qnt Hg)
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	probably
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	Action
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	3	May be not - a PA
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	due to 1182
Other Factors	5	soils IM/ma
C =	51	

Total Score = A x B x C = 1020

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1231
OU No e

Value Vault 7

Evaluation Date 2/17/99
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	3	UNKNOWN beneath box
Current Environmental Quality	2	probably
Potential for Contaminant Migration	2	probably
A =	7	
Representativeness of Data	4	rec runt < up
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	colisom - g / Pmo 2
Technology	5	
Implementability	1	S A UTIL PA
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	re route New PWL
Worker Safety	3	MEDIAN
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	MEDIAN
Ease of Waste Disposal	3	MEDIAN
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	3	MIX
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	probably
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	3	In PA near 707
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	due to 1231
Other Factors	1	Part of New PWL
C =	38	

Total Score = A x B x C = 1069

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 135
OU No 8

334 Cooling Tower

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	No Cont
Current Environmental Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	B = 3	UNDER DNT TDS SAMPLING
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	3	MEDIAN
Technology	3	MEDIAN
Implementability	1	IN USE, UTILS PA
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	(IN USE?)
Worker Safety	4	PROBABLY
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	MEDIAN
Ease of Waste Disposal	4	STRAIGHT HAZ
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	3	MIXED
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	NO URGENCY
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	3	DID NOT ACHIEVE
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	3	MEDIAN
Other Factors	1	DOESN'T
C =	32	

Total Score = A x B x C = 288

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 137
OU No 8

Evaluation Date 2/17/74
Evaluators AWS

712/713 Cooling Tower

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<small>Low Potential</small> <small>High Potential</small>	2	BLow OFF
Current Environmental Quality	<small>Acceptable Quality</small> <small>Poor Quality</small>	3	MEDIAN
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<small>Low Potential</small> <small>High Potential</small>	2	WIND DISPERSION
A =	7		
Representativeness of Data	<small>Insufficient</small> <small>Sufficient</small>	B = 3	NO SOIL SAMPLES IN THE TOWER
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<small>Very Slow-Slow</small> <small>Very Fast</small>	4	PROBABLY
Technology	<small>Needs New Tech "Off the Shelf"</small>	3	DID OF A COOLING TOWER?
Implementability	<small>Many Obstacles</small> <small>No Obstacles</small>	3	USES / PA / USE
Design/Implementation Schedule	<small>Long Lead</small> <small>Short-Lead</small>	3	IN USE
Worker Safety	<small>Risk to Worker</small> <small>Low Risk to worker</small>	3	BLow OFF
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<small>High Volume of waste</small> <small>Low Volume of waste</small>	5	LICKI
Ease of Waste Disposal	<small>TRU Mixed</small> <small>No waste</small>	4	STRAIGHT PATH
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<small>Very Conservative</small> <small>MPP</small>	3	PROBABLY MIX
Public and Agency Acceptability	<small>Not well-Received</small> <small>Fully Accepted</small>	3	MEDIAN
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<small>No</small> <small>Yes</small>	3	DO INTERFERENCE
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<small>Leaves Negative Impact</small> <small>Leaves No Negative Impact</small>	3	PROBABLY
Other Factors	<small>Dest. Environment</small> <small>Accumulative Dest.</small>	1	Defor
C =	38		

Total Score = A x B x C = 798

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 38
OU No 9

Evaluation Date 2/17/84
Evaluators MKS

779 Colvin Tower

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	BURIED
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Good Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor Quality	1	PROBABLY
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	NO CONTACT?
A =	3		
Representativeness of Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Representative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fairly Representative <input type="checkbox"/> Not Representative	B = 1	NEEDS FURTHER SAMPLING
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Flexible <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fairly Flexible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Flexible	4	SOIL REWORK / REROUTING
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs New Tools <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> "Off the Shelf"	4	
Implementability	<input type="checkbox"/> Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles	2	UTILIS / PA /
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Long Lead <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short Lead	5	MEDIAN
Worker Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to Worker	5	PROBABLY
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> High Volume of Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of Waste	4	MAYBE
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Difficult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Moderate <input type="checkbox"/> No Waste	2	IF WASTE IS LOW
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Community Oriented <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DTP Oriented	3	MIX
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well-Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy Accepted	3	NO MAJOR ACHIEVEMENT
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	DO D OF 779 MAY INVEST
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Causes Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Causes No Negative Impact	4	MAYBE
Other Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Remediations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment Remediation	1	DEFER
C =	3.0		

Total Score = A x B x C = 456

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1391
OU No 8

KOH NaOH, Condensate TCS

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators MKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	2 contained
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	2 NOT PRISTINE (Condensate TK)
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	3 Condensate TK
A =	7	
Representativeness of Data	Imperfect Perfect	B = 3 1 & 1/2
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	3 Median
Technology	Needs New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	3 Median
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	1 IN USE / UTILS / PA
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	1 IN USE
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	3 Median
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	3 Median
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU WASTE No Waste	4 straight away
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	50% Consistent 60% Workforce	5 Median
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	3 NO BIGGER movement
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	3 DAD f 774 / 779
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	3 Condensate tk now pm'd
Other Factors	Other Environmental Assessments	1 Defin
C =	33	

Total Score = A x B x C = 693

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1392

OU No 8

HF TK

Evaluation Date 3/17/94

Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 IN TK
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1 Probably - neutralized if spilled
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =	<u>3</u>	
Representativeness of Data	<u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u>	Urban tk <u>what?</u>
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	3 Median
Technology	From New Tech "off the shelf"	2 Routine
Implementability	Easy Implementation No Implementation	1 in use / util / pr
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	2 In use
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	3 BAD TURF
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	4 Probably
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No waste	4 if any straight hay
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Commitment Low Commitment	1 Probably
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not well Accepted Fully Accepted	3 moderate achievement
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	3 D&D
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Lesser Negative Impact Greater Negative Impact	5 on pavement
Other Factors	Other Information Additional Information	1 Defect
C =	<u>35</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 315

IHSS No 144
OU No 8

IHSS Evaluation Form

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators MKS

Severe Line Overflow

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 Cleared up
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	B = 4 - + any 4s
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5 soil samples
Technology	Needs New Tools "off the shelf"	5 "
Implementability	Easy Changes No Changes	3 up to 1/PA
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Shortened	3 Conf. range
Worker Safety	Not at Risk Low Risk to None	4 relatively
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	5 probably
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Hard No Hard	5 probably
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Cooperation Low Cooperation	5 maybe
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Policy Accepted	3 no major achievement
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	• •	1 D+D
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Lower Negative Impact Lowers No Negative Impact	7 probably
Other Factors	• Other Environmental Issues • Resource Conservation	1 Deficit
C =	45	

Total Score = A x B x C = 540

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1501
OU No B

OAD SITE NORTH # 771

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	TRAVESED DAILY
Current Environmental Quality	1	" "
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	NO UNKNOWN CONC
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	1	NO CONC IN GND UNDER PAVEMENT
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	3	MEDIAN
Technology	2	MEDIAN
Implementability	1	POOR
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	DID
Worker Safety	5	NO KNOWN CONC
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	MEDIAN
Ease of Waste Disposal	3	MEDIAN
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	3	MIX
Public and Agency Acceptability	1	DID
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	DID
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	3	MEDIAN
Other Factors	1	DID
C =	20	

Total Score = A x B x C = 84

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 150 2
OU No 8

RAD SITE W OF 771 / 776

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 TRANSPORT DAILY
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 NO UNKNOWN CONT.
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Insufficient Sufficient	B = 1 N - M - NO IN DOCUMENT
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Slow-Spoke Very Flexible	3 MEDIAN
Technology	Needs New Tools Off the Shelf	3 NOT AV
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	1 DID
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	1 DID
Worker Safety	Not Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5 NO UNKNOWN CONT
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	3 MEDIAN
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Difficult	3 NOT AV
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	IHS Cooperative A - IHP Workers	3 MAX
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	1 DID
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1 DID
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	3 MEDIAN
Other Factors	Other Environmental Assessments Available	1 DID
C =	28	

Total Score = A x B x C = 84

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1503
OU No 9

R&D SITE RECENTLY 7/16/20

Evaluation Date 2/17/04
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 BURNED
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	3 FD CONTROLS
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	3 MEDIAN
A =	7	
Representativeness of Data	Acceptable Questionable	1 SAME C2 - NNGC
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	1 TUNNEL IN NEEDING
Technology	Mostly New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	3 METH
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	1 DED
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	1 DED
Worker Safety	High Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	3 MEDIAN
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	2 PROBABLY
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Waste	2 MW - Possibly Pu but no L'gnd
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Commitment Low Commitment	3 MAX
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Respected Fully Accepted	1 DED
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1 DED
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Lesser Negative Impact More Negative Impact	3 MEDIUM
Other Factors	Other None	1 DED
C =	22	

Total Score = A x B x C = 154

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 150 4
OU No 8

NET SITE NW OF 750

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AES

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 TRAVERSED DA IT
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	2 UNKNOWN UNDER PAVEMENT
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 CAIPE)
A =	<u>4</u>	
Representativeness of Data	IMPROVEMENT SUFFICIENT	B = <u>2</u> UT ANGLE UNDER PAVEMENT
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Slow-Slow Very Fast	5 SL REMOVAL ~
Technology	Needs New Tools "out the door"	5
Implementability	Easy Implement No Obstacles	1 UT LS / PA / DED
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	1 ~
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	3 MEDIAN
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	3 MEDIAN
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRUE Mixed No waste	3 STRAIGHT RAD?
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	50% Government 40% citizens	3 mix
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	2 DED
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1 DED
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5 probably
Other Factors	Other Remediation Acceptance Remediation	1 DED
C =	<u>33</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 264

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1505
OU No 9

RAD SIZE W OF 707

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	3	SAME AS 123 1-2
Current Environmental Quality	2	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	2	
A =	<u>7</u>	
Representativeness of Data	B = 4	
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	
Technology	5	
Implementability	1	
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	
Worker Safety	3	
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	
Ease of Waste Disposal	3	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	3	
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	3	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	
Other Factors	1	
C =	<u>38</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 1064

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1506
OU No 3

PAGE 5 OF 779

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	Area's remediated
Current Environmental Quality	1	-
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	
A =	<u>3</u>	
Representativeness of Data	B = <u>4</u>	area narrow, few -
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	Already Remediated
Technology	5	Let's Conducting Samples
Implementability	3	UTILS/PA
Design/Implementation Schedule	4	Conducting Samples
Worker Safety	5	Samples
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	5	sample
Ease of Waste Disposal	5	Samples
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	Maybe
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	DAD
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	3	DAD
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	
Other Factors	3	MEDIAN
C =	<u>5</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 60Z

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1507
OU No 8

RAT SITE S OF 776

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators MJS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 CAPPED BY ROAD
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	3 MODERATE
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 GOOD
A =	5	
Representativeness of Data	Representative Unrepresentative	B = 4 Current, many
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	4 Safer
Technology	From New York Off the Shelf	5 "
Implementability	Many Options No Options	1 UTILS / PA / DAD
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	3 "
Worker Safety	Safe to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5 Safer
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5 Safer
Ease of Waste Disposal	No waste Yes waste	5 maybe
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	HSR Concerned & RFP Vetoed	3 Mix
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not well-Received Fully Accepted	3 D+D
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	Yes No	1 D+D
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	4 MAYBE
Other Factors	Under Development Unknown	1 D+D
C =	40	

Total Score = A x B x C = 800

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1508
OU No 8

RAD SIZE NE OF 779

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 <i>Remediated</i>
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 <i>1</i>
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Excellent Sufficient	4 <i>near - same</i>
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5 <i>Crit. Range</i>
Technology	Made New York "Off the Shelf"	5 <i>-</i>
Implementability	Many Options No Options	1 <i>VHS/DVD/PA</i>
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Lived	1 <i>-</i>
Worker Safety	Not to Worker Low Risk to worker	5 <i>Probability</i>
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5 <i>Probabil</i>
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRUE WASTE No waste	5 <i>Maybe</i>
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	Not Concerned Very Concerned	3 <i>My</i>
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	1 <i>DID</i>
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1 <i>DID</i>
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Lower Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	4 <i>May be</i>
Other Factors	Other Information Additional Information	1 <i>DID</i>
C =	37	

Total Score = A x B x C = 444

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 151OU No 8

Fuel Oil Spills

Evaluation Date 2/17/94Evaluators MKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	PAVED
Current Environmental Quality	2	UNKNOWN & DETER TIC
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	'CLAPPED'
A =	4	
Representativeness of Data	4	rec'd int samples
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	-X cont samples
Technology	5	
Implementability	1	UTILS / TA / IN USE
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	
Worker Safety	5	contained
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	MEDIAN
Ease of Waste Disposal	4	straight hang if any
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	3	MIX
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	MEDIAN
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	DID
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	4	maybe
Other Factors	1	DID
C =	36	

Total Score = A x B x C = 576

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1631
OU No 3

WASH M4
PAD SITE 700 AREA 3

Evaluation Date 2/17/04
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	TRANSPORT DAILY
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Average Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	
	A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sufficient	4	1 hr samples
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Site-Specific <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Flexible	5	Conf samples
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs New Tools <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> "Off the Shelf"	5	
Implementability	<input type="checkbox"/> Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles	1	UTILS /PA /in use
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Long Term <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-Term	3	" "
Worker Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to Worker	5	TRANSPORT DAILY
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> High Volume of waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of waste	5	MAYBE
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Difficult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No issue	5	probably
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Considered <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 50% Vets	3	MIX
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well-Received <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fully Accepted	1	DID
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	1	DID
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Large Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low or No Negative Impact	5	probably
Other Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Major Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor Impact	1	Def for till DID
	C =	40	

Total Score = A x B x C = 480

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1632
OU No 8

Amer corru SLCB

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION		
SAFETY				
Exposure Potential	<small>Low Potential High Potential</small>	1	Based	
Current Environmental Quality	<small>Acceptable Quality Poor Quality</small>	1	"	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<small>Low Potential High Potential</small>	1	Innocuous loc + i - d	
	A =	3		
Representativeness of Data	<small>Unrepresentative Representative</small>	B =	4	+ v ca -
REMEDIATION				
Flexibility	<small>Very Stagnant Very Flexible</small>	5	Stagnant	
Technology	<small>From New York, "Off the Shelf"</small>	5	"	
Implementability	<small>Many Obstacles No Obstacles</small>	3	Under Control (-n b)	
Design/Implementation Schedule	<small>Long Term Short-Term</small>	2	Rapid	
Worker Safety	<small>Not so Safe Low Risk to worker</small>	5	Am	
WASTE MANAGEMENT				
Waste Generation	<small>High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste</small>	4	-S reserve	
Ease of Waste Disposal	<small>TRU Waste No waste</small>	3	Stagnant red	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY				
Work Force	<small>IHS Contract IHP Workers</small>	5	probable	
Public and Agency Acceptability	<small>Not Well-Received Fully Accepted</small>	5	Action	
BENEFICIAL USE				
Achieves Final Resolution	<small>No Yes</small>	3	maybe	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY				
Environmental Impact	<small>Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact</small>	3	residual Am?	
Other Factors	<small>Only Environmental Environmental and Social</small>	5	Accell	
	C =	48		

Total Score = A x B x C = 576

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 172
OU No 9

Central Ave Waste Spill

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 Trashed daily
Current Environmental Quality	Good Quality Poor Quality	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	High Representativeness Low Representativeness	B = 4 See - - - - > - 1 - 5
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5 Sampling
Technology	Needs New Tools, "out the Box"	5
Implementability	Easy Implementation No Implementation	1 in use / TA / utility
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	1
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5 none
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5 likely
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRUE Name No Name	5 likely
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Commitment Low Turnover	5 maybe
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	3 So what?
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	• =	1 D+D
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	4 maybe
Other Factors	Under Development Unknown	5 off loads
C =	45	

Total Score = A x B x C = 540

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 173
OU No 8

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

South Dock 991

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 <i>Partment</i>
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1 <i>"</i>
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 <i>"</i>
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Highly Representative Somewhat Representative	1 <i>see chart in notes</i>
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	4 <i>settin & scaling</i>
Technology	Needs New Tools "off the shelf"	5 <i>Gamma</i>
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	1 <i>solutions/PA</i>
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	1 <i>"</i>
Worker Safety	High Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5 <i>no cut known</i>
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	5 <i>"</i>
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Waste	5 <i>none</i>
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	Very Conservative Very Varied	5 <i>probably</i>
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Respected Policy Acceptable	3 <i>so what</i>
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	Yes	1 <i>D+D</i>
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact	4 <i>maybe</i>
Other Factors	Other Determinants None Determinants	1 <i>Defin</i>
C =	40	

Total Score = A x B x C = 480

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 184
OU No 9

991 Steam Clean Ag Area

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	No Known Cont.
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1	
	A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Inconsistent Consistent	4	$\sim \sim \sim \sim$
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Slow-Slow Very Fast	5	Sample
Technology	Needs Many Years "Off the Shelf"	5	1
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	3	Util / PA
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	3	Mod Int
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	5	none
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5	5
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No waste	5	none)
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	Very Uncooperative Very Cooperative	5	Probably
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not well-Respected Fully Accepted	3	no risk reduction
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	3	D&D
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Lower Negative Impact Lower No Negative Impact	5	Probably
Other Factors	Deter Environmental Impact Promote Environmental Impact	1	wait
	C =	48	

Total Score = A x B x C = 576

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 188
OU No 8

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators A125

ACID LEAK

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A = 2		
Representativeness of Data	Inadequate Sufficient Excellent	B = 5 Same area
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5
Technology	Needs New Tools Off the Shelf	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	5
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	5
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	NTE Cooperative NTE Virtuous	5
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not well Accepted Fully Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5
Other Factors	Deteriorating Accumulating	5
C = 60		

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 121-A
OU No 7

OUTSIDE NOVACOR
OP WL - PRE D&D
SEC MENS

Evaluation Date 2/21/94
Evaluators MES, Cawley

A

C

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	3 MEDIAN
Current Environmental Quality	Good Quality Poor Quality	5
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	4
A =		62
Representativeness of Data	Excellent Fair Poor	B = 4.3 IN PROGRESS
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Slow-Slow Very Flexible	3 ACCESSIBILITY
Technology	Needs New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	3
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	3 PA / + 11
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	3 REGULATORY
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	7.1 + c long
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	3 MEDIUM
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Waste	2 MW
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	Very Opposed S - Oppressed	1
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	5 Accomplishment w/ Rad
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	3 PARTIAL
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Less Negative Impact Less No Negative Impact	4.3 NOT PUNISHING
Other Factors	Major Minor	5 RECL
C =		35

Total Score = A x B x C = 1260

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 121
OU No 9

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators KES

OPWL INN06R OR IN USE

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	X <u>2</u> 3	Banned song accessible
Current Environmental Quality	5	probably
Potential for Contaminant Migration	4	mostly 1, 2nd?
A =	<u>72 12</u>	
Representativeness of Data	B = <u>3</u> 1	and u-u
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	1	pipeline + the -in
Technology	X <u>3</u>	using MEDIAN
Implementability	1	high / A
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	
Worker Safety	X <u>1</u>	MEDIAN Trenched, excavated
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	X <u>1</u>	1/6,
Ease of Waste Disposal	2	maybe MW
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1	likem
Public and Agency Acceptability	X <u>2</u> 1	MEDIAN? INACCESSIBILITY
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	X <u>3</u>	B+D part A
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	X <u>3</u>	? MEDIAN
Other Factors	X <u>2</u> 1	W/DID TREATMENT APPROVED
C =	<u>21 26 24</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C =

780 755
700 728

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1732
OU No 9

VALVE VALVE - 707

Evaluation Date 2/10/84
Evaluators MCS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	3 PROBABLY
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	2 UNKNOWN
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	3 MEDIAN
A =	8	
Representativeness of Data	Insufficient Sufficient	B = 3 1 NL - A 707
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5 SOLVING
Technology	Most New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Very Difficult No Obstacles	1 PA UTILS P MNT
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	3 1 INTRUSIVE
Worker Safety	High Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	4 NOT PRISTINE
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	3 4 MEDIAN
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Waste	2 POTENTIALLY
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	HES Concerned HES Unconcerned	1 PROBABLY
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	3 DICEY
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No	2 NOT LIKELY
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5 FROM 1732
Other Factors	Major Adverse Adverse Adverse	1 DETER
C =	34	

Total Score = A x B x C = 876 544

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 124
OU No 9

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators A46

Holding TKs

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	4
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	4
A =	10	
Representativeness of Data	Incomplete Substance	B = 3 <i>in progress</i>
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Inflexible Very Flexible	2
Technology	Makes New Tools "Off the Shelf"	2
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	X 2 <i>w/ 1</i>
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	1 <i>6 w/ 2</i>
Worker Safety	High Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	2
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	2
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No waste	2
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	Most Contractors Some Workers	1
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Large Negative Impact Lowers No Negative Impact	X 4
Other Factors	Only Assessment Assessments Assessed	X 2
C =	20	

Total Score = A x B x C = 260 795

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 125
OU No 9

TANK C6

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	BURIED
Current Environmental Quality	4	PROBABLY
Potential for Contaminant Migration	4	PROBABLY
A =	10	
Representativeness of Data	B = 1	VIC) SIL TANK - UNDER - K
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	2	PROX UNDER BUILDING
Technology	2	MW SIL TREATMENT
Implementability	1	PROX → BLG
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	PROX to BLG
Worker Safety	2	POTENTIALLY
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	2	LKEV
Ease of Waste Disposal	2	MW prob TRU MW - COL D
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1	PROBABLY
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	CET IT OUT
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	BLG 774
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	REGRADING
Other Factors	1	DEFER
C =	26	

Total Score = A x B x C = 200 700

12/24

700

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 126
OU No 9

PROCESS WASTE TANKS

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 BURIED UNDER PAVEMENT
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	4 PROBABLY
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	4 PROBABLY
A =	9	
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	B = 3 1 UNDERR-K- INSUFF HYPOTHETICAL
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	4 TK YANK SOI SAMPLING
Technology	Needs New Tech. "off the shelf"	X +
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	3 1 UTIL / PA / IN USE
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	X 1 MAYBE
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	3 CONTROLS
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	3 METHAN - UNKNOWN
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No waste	2 TRW, MAY BE TRU MW, SOLID
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	Not Compromised SMP Workers	3 1 MIXED?
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not well-Received Policy Accepted	X 1 ACTION, USE OF TK
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	+	4 PROBABLY DUE TO ISOLATION
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Lesser Negative Impact Lower No Negative Impact	5 RECYCLED
Other Factors	Under Investigation Assessments Recommended	X 1 GOOD INSIDE PA PER
C =	46 30	270 Total Score = A x B x C = <u>1242</u>

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 127
OU No 9

LL RAD WASTE CTRK

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 BURIED
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	3 MEDIAN
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	3 MEDIAN
A =	7	
Representativeness of Data	Insufficient Sufficient	B = 3 SAMPLES NEAR SEPs
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Flexible Flexible	3 MEDIAN
Technology	Needs New Tech Old Tech	5 SOIL - RECOVERED?
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	4/3 UPS / PA / SGP
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	X 3 DUE TO OBSTACLES
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	3 MEDIAN
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	3 MEDIAN
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No waste	2 MW, MINE TREN, SOLID
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Concern Low Concern	X 1 MIXED
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	3/5 60% FCT WANT ACHIEVE FINAL RES
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	X 54 DISTANCE AT DED MAYBE
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5 PROBABLY
Other Factors	Other Considerations Assessments	X 3 DEFER UNTIL AT LEAST AFTER SEPs
C =	3440	840 868

Total Score = A x B x C = 868

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 132
OU No 9

RAD SITE # 4 700 AREA

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	BURIED UNDER BUILDING
Current Environmental Quality	4	POSSIBLY
Potential for Contaminant Migration	4	PROBABLY
A =	9	
Representativeness of Data	X 3	NORMA NUCR TANCS, 1 PROB
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	4	TK YNK
Technology	5	
Implementability	1	UTCS / PLANT LOADS / IN USE
Design/Implementation Schedule	3	MEDIAN
Worker Safety	3	LIKELY
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	X 4	WAyBE
Ease of Waste Disposal	2	MW, MAYBE TRUE, SOLID
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1	PROBABLY
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	MEDIAN
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	3	MAYBE NOT BECAUSE OF D&D
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	4	POSSIBLY
Other Factors	X 3	WAIT TLL D&D, ACTIVE BUT NEGOTIABLE
C =	32.74	

Total Score = A x B x C = 576 972

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 146
OU No 9

Conc Proc Wst TIC

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators AICS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	UNDERGROUND
Current Environmental Quality	5	Known cont'n
Potential for Contaminant Migration	5	
A =	11	
Representativeness of Data	2	UBC
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	1	Des yr issues
Technology	3	Med on
Implementability	1	UBC
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	UBC
Worker Safety	1	BAD STUFF
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	1	PUBHA-11
Ease of Waste Disposal	1	TRUE MIXED - SOLID
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1	most likely
Public and Agency Acceptability	2	D&D
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	D&D
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	3	Med on
Other Factors	1	UBC
C =	17	

Total Score = A x B x C = 374

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 471
OU No 9

Maz Area

Evaluation Date 2/18/91
Evaluators JKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	Buried
Current Environmental Quality	4	need samples - probably cont
Potential for Contaminant Migration	4	
A =	9	
Representativeness of Data	3	not exact - less than 5
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	1	expensive - 10 / PSZ
Technology	3	sample / remove
Implementability	1	10 / ps / PS
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	
Worker Safety	3	medium
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	high
Ease of Waste Disposal	2	maybe
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1	likely
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	medium
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	DID of PSR
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	4	maybe
Other Factors	1	DID
C =	36.22	199 Total Score = A x B x C = <u>702</u>

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 159
OU No 9

PAD SICC 559

Evaluation Date 2/17/99
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS		SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	UNDER BLC
Current Environmental Quality	Good Quality Poor Quality	3	UNKNOWN UNDER BLC
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	3	CROPPED'
A =		7	
Representativeness of Data	Very Representative Somewhat Representative	B = X 3	UBC, in progress
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	1	UBC
Technology	Requires New Tools, "out of the Box"	1	UBC
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	1	UBC (U-US EPA 16 vs off-the-shelf)
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	1	- agility
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	3	M-DIAN
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	3	UNKNOWN
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No waste	2	MW - MATERIALLY, SOLIDS
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	Not Concerned SVP Concerned	3	MIX
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not well Accepted Fully Accepted	1	UBC / DOD
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1	DOD / UBC
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact	3	MAY BE
Other Factors	Under Investigation - Assimilated Information	1	DOD
C =		21	4A1 +47

Total Score = A x B x C = _____

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 215
OU No 9

T-40 TK 771

Evaluation Date 2/18/94
Evaluators MLS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	INSIDE BLG - EXPOSED TO
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	1
	A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sufficient	B =	POOR
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Site-Specific <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Flexible	1	NS DE PLG
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs New Tools <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> "Off the Shelf"	3	LICING, 1 & do BLG - WI WELLS
Implementability	<input type="checkbox"/> Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles	1	1 to 7/4 / 2008 WORK / TS
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Long Lead <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-Lead	1	~
Worker Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to Worker	1	probable
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> High Volume of waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of waste	3	Median
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> TRU Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non TRU	2	MW, ~ 1/2 be TRU
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Considered <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Considered	X X 3	MIX
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well-Received <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fully Accepted	1	DOD
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	DOD
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Moderate Negative Impact	5	inside BLG
Other Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Major Environmental Concern <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Moderate Environmental Concern	1	DOD
	C =	27 23	

Total Score = A x B x C = 81 69

7/1

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 122
OU No 9

Evaluation Date 2/10/94
Evaluators AES

Underground Concrete TK

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	buried
Current Environmental Quality	3	Median
Potential for Contaminant Migration	2	
	A = <u>7</u>	
Representativeness of Data	B = <u>3</u>	-- <-- - - - - - -
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	1	VBC
Technology	2 3	Sample soil + water conq. analysis
Implementability	1	rc/ub
Design/Implementation Schedule	2	" "
Worker Safety	3	W.C.
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	2	Median
Ease of Waste Disposal	3	Pro. MW
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1	Likely
Public and Agency Acceptability	1	D.D.)
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	D.D.)
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	3	Median
Other Factors	1	D.D)
	C = <u>24 23</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 704 483

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 149

OU No 9

↓
OU4?

CPWL TO SEPs

Evaluation Date 2/17/04

Evaluators MKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	Inured
Current Environmental Quality	3	MASKED BY SEPs
Potential for Contaminant Migration	3	-
A =	7	
Representativeness of Data	X 3	-> DATA PREZAGL-
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	3	Median
Technology	2	
Implementability	X 3	SEPS/UTILS/PA coord w/ GEP
Design/Implementation Schedule	X 3	
Worker Safety	3	Median
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	Median
Ease of Waste Disposal	2	MW f any
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	X 3	most likely, f place due to SEP
Public and Agency Acceptability	X 4	small protest in conjunct w/GEP
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	X 4	SEP ACTIVITIES
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	due to 149
Other Factors	X 3	Deficit till SEPs - access to SEQ
C =	27.39	

Total Score = A x B x C = 27.39 GM

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 129
OU No 10

Evaluation Date 2/17/04
Evaluators ACS

OIC CFAIR

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	Burnt
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor Quality	4	need cont sample
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	X 2	likely - CAPED
A =	<u>87</u>		
Representativeness of Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sufficient	B = 3	re = sample
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Stagnant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Flexible	3	utls
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs New Tools <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> "out the same"	5	soil sampling
Implementability	<input type="checkbox"/> Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles	1	utls / reuse
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Long Lead <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-Lead	1	
Worker Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk to worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to worker	5	probably
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> High volume of waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of waste	3	MEDIAN
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Difficult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No issue	4	straight Hwy
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Consistent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EPP Partners	1	probably
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well-Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fully Accepted	4	maybe?
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	D4D
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Causes Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Causes no Negative Impact	4	maybe?
Other Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ammunition Assessment	1	D4D
C =	<u>33</u>		<u>693</u> <u>891</u>

Total Score = A x B x C = 891

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 170
OU No 10

Evaluation Date 2/17/94
Evaluators MKS

PU (D) YARD

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	2	Could be cont soil
Current Environmental Quality	3	MEDIAN NOT PRISTINE
Potential for Contaminant Migration	4	Likely in soil
A =	9	
Representativeness of Data	B = <u>3 4 5</u>	<i>In progress</i> WASTED - except c score w nsut
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	4	SOIL / CIV RENT
Technology	5	"
Implementability	5	Buffer zone ALREADY CLEANED
Design/Implementation Schedule	4	Reg approval?
Worker Safety	5	Routine no risks
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	MEDIAN
Ease of Waste Disposal	4	straight Haul
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	3	Mix?
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	NO RAD CLEANUP
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	5	no impact from D&D
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	4	Dep on clean-up std
Other Factors	5	GO FOR IT
C =	50	

Total Score = A x B x C = 1350 ~~1800~~ 2250

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 174
OU No 10

Evaluation Date 2/12/94
Evaluators MCS

PUAD Sto Argas

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	2	Same as 170
Current Environmental Quality	3	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	4	
A =	9	
Representativeness of Data	3	
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	4	
Technology	5	
Implementability	5	
Design/Implementation Schedule	4	
Worker Safety	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	
Ease of Waste Disposal	4	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	3	
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	5	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	4	
Other Factors	5	
C =	50	1800 735 2250

Total Score = A x B x C = _____

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 175
OU No 10

Evaluation Date 2/18/94
Evaluators AKW

Contractor SJB FAC

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 Any Cont?
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1 No Cont
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Excellent Good Fair Poor	B = 4 Can Sam -
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5 Soil Cont?
Technology	1 "From New York, 8 "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles 8 No Obstacles	3 & 5 use DA/Utilis In progress
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	3 & 5 " " "
Worker Safety	High Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5 Soil sampling
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	5 S any?
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Waste	4 & 5 Hazard only?
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	60% Consistent 80% Variable	5 maybe?
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Policy Accepted	8 & 5 no big accomplishment do it
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	8 & Median DD may impact area small size
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5 likely
Other Factors	Other Remediation Accommodate Remediation	8 & Median
C =	29.00	900 348

Total Score = A x B x C = 348

178

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 176
OU No 10

SFW Yard

Evaluation Date 2/21/04
Evaluators MCS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	5	To revised daily
Current Environmental Quality	3	Med a1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	-	Med a1
A =	11	
Representativeness of Data	B = <u>3</u> 4	s f soil completed rad survey done
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	11 campus
Technology	-	
Implementability	2 4	use / util/ra in progress / cleanup w/
Design/Implementation Schedule	2 4	" "
Worker Safety	5	Soil sampling
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	Medium
Ease of Waste Disposal	4 2	from MW?
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1	Contract Tech support
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	no big accomplishment
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	3	Medium
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	3	Med a1
Other Factors	3 5	Median in progress
C =	# 43	

$$\text{Total Score} = A \times B \times C = \underline{\underline{1449}}$$

20
7/9
a a

1892

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 177
OU No 10

885 Dren Stz Acre

Evaluation Date 2/18/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	No known cont
Current Environmental Quality	1	-
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	-
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	5	Same as site w/ 51 sites 21
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	cont sampling
Technology	5	-
Implementability	1	240 sec sec area, invse
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	-
Worker Safety	5	non-road area
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	5	-
Ease of Waste Disposal	3	could have roads
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	Likely
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	Median
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	D&D C 981
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	-
Other Factors	1	D&D
C =	40	

Total Score = A x B x C = 600

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 181
OU No 10

Evaluation Date 2/16/94
Evaluators AVS

334 Cargo Cont Area

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 No cont
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 1
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	B = <u>A 5</u> <u>representative</u> - nothing to sample
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Difficult Very Possible	5 Unit gen
Technology	Needs New Tools "out the Box"	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5 1
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short Lead	5
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	5 1 " "
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5 No waste
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Waste	5 " " "
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Opposition Low Opposition	5 likely
Public and Agency Acceptability	No Well-Received Policy Accepted	3 5 no big accomplishment off books
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	3 5 Major affected by DOD gen
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Lesser Negative Impact Lesser No Negative Impact	5 no cont
Other Factors	Greater Impact Acceptable Impact	5 do +
C =	5 5 60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 672 700

10K

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 182
OU No 10

444(45) Dunn St Area

Evaluation Date 2/18/94
Evaluators AICs

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	traversed daily
Current Environmental Quality	5	no cleanup of spilled oil
Potential for Contaminant Migration	4.52	paved - "capped"
A =	12.98	
Representativeness of Data	B = 2	near co + com, a
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	Sampling
Technology	5	
Implementability	1	Same area in use (D&D)
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	
Worker Safety	4.5	reservoir of soil no long unloading
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	Median
Ease of Waste Disposal	3	could be MW
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1	Unlikely
Public and Agency Acceptability	5.3	accomplish something want to D&D
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	D&D
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	3	Median
Other Factors	1	D&D
C =	33.32	

Total Score = A x B x C = 1789 76%

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 205
OU No 10

Evaluation Date 2/18/94
Evaluators AHS

460 Sump 3-Acid

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	Acid
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1	"
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1	"
	A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Inconsistent Sufficient	B = 4	Not low than
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Poor-Some Very Flexible	5	Sampling
Technology	Needs New Tools "on the Shelf"	2	"
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	1	DID / in use / served 2nd
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long time Short time	1	-
Worker Safety	Rust to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5	-
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High volume of waste Low Volume of waste	3	Med on
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very difficult Very easy	4	Hand of any
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	High Concern Low Concern	81	AHS DID contractor
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	3	Med on
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1	DID
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Lower Negative Impact Higher No Negative Impact	43	~ median
Other Factors	Lower Impact Higher Impact	1	DID
	C =	2733	

Total Score = A x B x C = 444 2 394

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 206
 OU No 10

INAC-15 TK 2876

Evaluation Date 2/18/94
 Evaluators AIS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 No cont
Current Environmental Quality	Poor Quality Good Quality	1 "
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 "
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	B = 4 need some, or
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Slow-Change Very Fast	5 Sa vri -
Technology	Moderately New Tech. "off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	3 Util < (PA / DAD)
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long-Lived Short-Lived	3 "
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5 no wstr
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5 of any
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No waste	4 high if any
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Cooperation Low Tolerance	5 liking DAD
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Policy Accepted	3 Median
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1 DAD
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Large Negative Impact Large No Negative Impact	5 No cont
Other Factors	Some Amelioration Extensive Amelioration	3 medium DAD
C =	47.41	

Total Score = A x B x C = 47.41 492

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 707
OU No 10Evaluation Date 2/16/94
Evaluators AKS

444 Acid Dumpster

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	No cart
Current Environmental Quality	1	" "
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	" "
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	B = 4	and --- f "
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	employ
Technology	5	capping
Implementability	3	D+D/utl/D/soiled Areas
Design/Implementation Schedule	3	" " "
Worker Safety	5	NO C/C/T
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	5	if guy
Ease of Waste Disposal	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5 / 1	Wtly D/D
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	Med an
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	D/D
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	due to 207
Other Factors	3 / 1	Med an
C =	48 - 92	

Total Score = A x B x C = 576 504

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 208
OU No 10

Evaluation Date 2/18/94
Evaluators AUS

QA (AA) Waste Site a'

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 No cont
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1 -
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Incomplete Incomplete	B = 4 representative
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Slow-Slow Very Flexible	5 Sampling
Technology	Needs New Tools "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Very Difficult No Difficulties	3 DOD Util/Scanned Area
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short Lead	3 1 " "
Worker Safety	High Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5 no cont
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5 sludge
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRUE Disposal No Disposal	5 none
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Commitment Low Commitment	8 1 likely contractor
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully accepted	3 Median
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1 Dad)
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Large Negative Impact - Lowers No Negative Impact	5
Other Factors	Other Information Acceptable Information	3 1 Median
C =	48 + 2	504 576

Total Score = A x B x C = 576

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 210
OU No 10

Evaluation Date 2/18/94
Evaluators AICs

980 Cargo Cnt

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	(No cont)
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	()
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1 ,
A =		3
Representativeness of Data	Imperfect Perfect	B = A5 : 1 + ca 1 st in progress
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Non-Sensitive Very Flexible	5 : Can't Sampling
Technology	Needs New Tech. "off the Shelf"	5 : -
Implementability	Very Difficult No Difficulties	3 5 : DND / i use PDA in progress
Design/implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	3 5 : 7 " "
Worker Safety	High Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5 : no waste
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Amount of Waste Low Amount of Waste	5 : none
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Difficulties	5 : none
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Concern Low Concern	5 : likely
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Well Accepted	3 5 : Med an
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	0 = No 1 = Yes	3 5 : maybe DND NFA
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Less Impact More Impact	5 : None
Other Factors	Other Information	3 5 : probably NFA
C =		60

Total Score = A x B x C = 600 / 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 213
OU No 10Evaluation Date 2/18/94
Evaluators ATCS

904 PAD

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	2	Restricted Area?
Current Environmental Quality	2	,
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	Contaminant, packed
A =	5	
Representativeness of Data	5	40%
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	Clean up
Technology	5	
Implementability	1	in use / not yet Active unit
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	X
Worker Safety	4	w/o waste
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	5	little
Ease of Waste Disposal	3	maybe MW
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	3	Mix
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	Waste site
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	D&D
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	3	Median
Other Factors	1	Defer in use
C =	37.35	

Total Score = A x B x C = 925 875

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 214
OU No 10

Evaluation Date 2/18/04
Evaluators AHS

750 Pad

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	2	restricted area
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor Quality	2	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	impacts contained
	A =	5	
Representativeness of Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Impeccable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fairly Good	5	Simple analysis
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Site-Specific <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Flexible	5	Clean up
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs New Tech. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Off the Shelf	5	
Implementability	<input type="checkbox"/> Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles	1	PA / tribal use
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Long Term <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-Term	1	~ ~ ~
Worker Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to Worker	4	RCA?
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> High Volume of Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of Waste	5	~
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Difficult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No issue	3	can't be MW
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Considered <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Diff. Various	3	Mix
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well-Received <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fully Accepted	3	Where will the waste go?
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	1	D&D
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Causes Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Causes No Negative Impact	3	~
Other Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Major Determinant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor Determinant	1	D&D
	C =	35	

Total Score = A x B x C = 875

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 169
OU No 11

WSF

Evaluation Date 2/12/94
Evaluators A/S

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	<small>Low Potential</small> <small>High Potential</small>	1
Current Environmental Quality	<small>Acceptable Quality</small> <small>Poor Quality</small>	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<small>Low Potential</small> <small>High Potential</small>	1
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	<small>Unrepresentative</small> <small>Representative</small>	B = <i>unc - ~ - ~ + 1/2</i>
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	<small>Very Slow-Spoke</small> <small>Very Flexible</small>	5
Technology	<small>Needs New Tech.</small> <small>"out of the chart"</small>	5
Implementability	<small>Many Obstacles</small> <small>No Obstacles</small>	5
Design/Implementation Schedule	<small>Long Term</small> <small>Short-Term</small>	5
Worker Safety	<small>Risk to Worker</small> <small>Low Risk to worker</small>	5
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	<small>High Volume of waste</small> <small>Low Volume of waste</small>	5
Ease of Waste Disposal	<small>Very Difficult</small> <small>No waste</small>	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	<small>HSB Opposed</small> <small>1 - HSP actions</small>	5
Public and Agency Acceptability	<small>Not Well-Accepted</small> <small>Pretty Accepted</small>	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	<small>No</small> <small>Yes</small>	5
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	<small>Large Negative Impact</small> <small>Low or Negligible Impact</small>	5
Other Factors	<small>Other</small> <small>Other</small>	5
C =	60	<i>In Progress</i>

Total Score = A x B x C = 720

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1161
OU No 17

Evaluation Date 2/18/94
Evaluators AICs

447 West Landing Drk

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	-reversed daily
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Good Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor Quality	3	Median
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	2 1	within paved
	A =	<u>X 5</u>	
Representativeness of Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Unrepresentative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Representative	B =	<u>3 X 5</u> <u>no survey</u> <u>in progress</u>
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Site-Specific <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Flexible	4	could be red
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs New Tools <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> "off the shelf"	2	strip & hot spots
Implementability	<input type="checkbox"/> Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles	X 4	→ / in use/ Secured and util's
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Long Lead <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short Lead	X 3	util's
Worker Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to Worker	5	?
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> High Volume of Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of Waste	B 5	Median
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Difficult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Waste	3 2	could be Med
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well-Respected <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Highly Respected	B 1	Not contractor
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Fully Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fully Accepted	B 4	DID accomplishing clean up Economic Opportunity
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	1 4	DID fit backs
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Causes Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Causes No Negative Impact	B 5	bottom loading docks
Other Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Adverse Impacts <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None Adverse Impacts	X 5	DID Accelerate
	C =	<u>B3 A1</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 693 705

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 116 2
OU No 12

Evaluation Date 2/18/94
Evaluators AES

AAA & Land, Dock

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	Similar to 116 2
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Average Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor Quality	3	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	X 1	
	A =	<u>75</u>	
Representativeness of Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor	3	
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Site-Specific <input type="checkbox"/> Very Flexible	4	
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs New Tools <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> "off the shelf"	5	
Implementability	<input type="checkbox"/> Many Obstacles <input type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles	X 4	
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Long Lead <input type="checkbox"/> Short Lead	X 3	
Worker Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to Worker	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> High Volume of waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of waste	3 5	
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Difficult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Waste	X 2	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Concerned <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Concerned	X 1	
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well-Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fully Accepted	X 4	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="checkbox"/>	X 9	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Lowers Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increases Negative Impact	X 5	
Other Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Affect <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affects Adversely	X 6	
	C =	<u>33 47</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 693 705

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 120
OU No 12

Evaluation Date 2/28/94
Evaluators Axs

Fiberglassing Area

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	No cont?
Current Environmental Quality	1	"
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	" "
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	9	res and can --
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	Cost Savings
Technology	5	" "
Implementability	x 4	In use / Seamed areas are able to WIA
Design/Implementation Schedule	x 3	"
Worker Safety	5	No cont
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	< 5	No cont?
Ease of Waste Disposal	x 2	" "
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	x 1	Likely
Public and Agency Acceptability	x 4	DID
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	x 4	DID
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	Major
Other Factors	x 5	DID
C =	42	

Total Score = A x B x C = 504 705

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 136
OU No 12

Evaluation Date 2/16/94
Evaluators HLS

Cooling Tower Rader

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<small>Low Potential</small> <small>High Potential</small>	1	Traversed daily / <i>cont score 110</i>
Current Environmental Quality	<small>Acceptable Quality</small> <small>Poor Quality</small>	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<small>Low Potential</small> <small>High Potential</small>	1	
A =	3		
Representativeness of Data	<small>Insufficient</small> <small>Sufficient</small>	<small>B =</small> 4	<i>new corr supply</i>
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<small>Very Low - Generic</small> <small>Very Flexible</small>	5	No cont
Technology	<small>Needs New Tools</small> <small>"Off the Shelf"</small>	5	
Implementability	<small>Easy Changes</small> <small>No Changes</small>	3	utils / secured area / cause
Design/Implementation Schedule	<small>Long Lead</small> <small>Short-Lead</small>	3	" "
Worker Safety	<small>Risk to Worker</small> <small>Low Risk to Worker</small>	5	No cont
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<small>High Volume of Waste</small> <small>Low Volume of Waste</small>	5	" "
Ease of Waste Disposal	<small>Very Difficult</small> <small>No Waste</small>	5	" "
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<small>High Disengagement</small> <small>High Employee Turnover</small>	3	mix
Public and Agency Acceptability	<small>Not Well-Accepted</small> <small>Fully Accepted</small>	3	do more
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<small>No</small> <small>Yes</small>	1	DAD
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<small>Large Negative Impact</small> <small>Low to Negative Impact</small>	3	Medium
Other Factors	<small>Only Assessment</small> <small>Assessment + Management</small>	1	DAD
C =	42		

Total Score = A x B x C = 504 704

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1472
OU No 12

881 (Cover - (Area))

Evaluation Date 2/18/94
Evaluators MCS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	No cont?
Current Environmental Quality	1	" "
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	Copper
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	B = <u>4.5</u>	Rec 1/14/94 - no breakholes
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	4.5	Sample under pavement
Technology	5	"
Implementability	3.5	Secret area / -use/ DAD not lubed
Design/Implementation Schedule	3.5	- to DAD
Worker Safety	5	-
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	5	Q any
Ease of Waste Disposal	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	3.5	144 contact w/ place
Public and Agency Acceptability	3.5	what's being accomplished? If break
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	3.5	DAD not linked to DAD
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	4.5	-
Other Factors	X 6	DAD
C =	<u>4.5 x 4.5 x 4.5</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 529 - 90

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1572
OU No 12

Evaluation Date 2/12/04
Evaluators AKS

RAD Site Satz

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	traversed daily
Current Environmental Quality	2	known cont hot spots
Potential for Contaminant Migration	2	"Capped"
A =	<u>65</u>	
Representativeness of Data	B = <u>34</u>	near Super planned not in progress
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	34	Modif. hot spots
Technology	35	to do soil removal
Implementability	13	0tils/in use/second area
Design/Implementation Schedule	143	planned
Worker Safety	23	Median
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	54	Median
Ease of Waste Disposal	3	MW or Berullium
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1	Likely
Public and Agency Acceptability	15	→ economic opportunity
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	15	" "
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	34	Median
Other Factors	15	→ economic opps consider other internal IHSS to 1572
C =	<u>2445</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 132 900

IHSS No 187
OU No 12

IHSS Evaluation Form

*Sulfuric
ACID Spill*

Evaluation Date 2/12/94
Evaluators AICs

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	Acid
Current Environmental Quality	1	C'
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	"
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	B = 5	Cleared up
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	No cont
Technology	5	
Implementability	5	unassessible
Design/Implementation Schedule	5	✓
Worker Safety	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	5	
Ease of Waste Disposal	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	5	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	
Other Factors	5	
C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 189
OU No 12

Evaluation Date 2/2/94
Evaluators HCS

Nitric Acid + TCS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	Azo
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	
	A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sufficient	5	+ 1
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Slow-Spiraling <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Flexible	5	
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs New Tools <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Off the Shelf	5	
Implementability	<input type="checkbox"/> Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles	X5	in use } don't have to sample underneath so can stay use
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Long Term <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-Lived	X5	in use }
Worker Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to Worker	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> High Volume of Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of Waste	5	
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> TRU Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Waste	5	None
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="checkbox"/> HHS Classification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 - DPP Workers	5	
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well-Received <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fully Accepted	X5	agency approved WP
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Lowers Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increases No Negative Impact	5	
Other Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Another Assessment	5	
	C =	50	900

Total Score = A x B x C = 750

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 117

OU No 13

Coffey
North Side / Scrap Metal

Evaluation Date 2/20/94

Evaluators HCS - McHugh

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	3	MEDIAN
Current Environmental Quality	4	KNOWN CONT
Potential for Contaminant Migration	3	PARTIALLY PAVED
A =	10	
Representativeness of Data	3	# PROGRESS
REMEDIAL		
Flexibility	1	PSZ
Technology	3	MEDIAN
Implementability	3	MEDIAN PSZ/ UTILS/ REGULATION
Design/Implementation Schedule	2	TECHNOLOGY
Worker Safety	3	MEDIAN
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	MEDIAN
Ease of Waste Disposal	1	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1	CONTRACTOR
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	MEDIAN
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	PSZ / DID
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	NO POST CLOSURE
Other Factors	5	needs characterization
C =	31	

Total Score = A x B x C = 930

1172
IHSS No 117142
OU No 13

IHSS Evaluation Form

Evaluation Date 2/16/94
Evaluators Aces

Middle
North Site New Sts

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 Traveled daily
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	2 3 need samples
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	2 4 2 'CAPPED'
A =	5 8 6	
Representativeness of Data	B =	1 - -
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	3 Kdura
Technology	Needs New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	2 5
Implementability	Easy Changes No Changes	3 in use / h
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	3 -
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5 prior bly
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	1 Biotur
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No waste	2 2 storage near LL MW
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	HSB Construction S DPP Workers	3 hex
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	3 no chvle
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	3 Medigen
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Less Negative Impact Lowers No Negative Impact	2 5 Medigen
Other Factors	Other Considerations Assessments	1 D40 w/ 551
C =	3 9 41	784 786 1342

Total Score = A x B x C =

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1173
OU No 13

South site Chem St

Evaluation Date 2/18/14
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 <i>(none)</i>
Current Environmental Quality	Excellent Quality Poor Quality	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	B = 4 ee -
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	X 5 TK in water ignore area vulnerability
Technology	Needs New York "Off the shelf"	5 Same
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	1 5 TK in ways exclude areas under TK
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Lived	1 3 MEDIAN
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	3 5 Med - strength
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5 5 has a little cont
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No Waste	X 3 probably transporting MW
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	TRU Concerned No TRU Workers	3 Mix
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	X 3 Below MEDIAN
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	• •	1 DAD of TK
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact	3 5 Median low prob of cont
Other Factors	Under Assessment Accomplished Assessment	X 5 DAD Accel characterize
C =	27 48	

Total Score = A x B x C = 324576

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 128
OU No 13

Evaluation Date 2/2/94
Evaluators HES

At Buu I, t #1

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	Burned
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	3	unknown
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	3	
A =	7		
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	B =	Used
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Sensitive Very Flexible	2	inured
Technology	From New Tech "Off the Shelf"	5	-
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	2	used 2/134/171
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	2	
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5	bare
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	3	Used -
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Difficult	4	straight Hwy & away
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	Not Well-Respected Very Respected	1	Likely
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	1	why do it?
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5	probably
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Large Negative Impact Large No Negative Impact	3	Median
Other Factors	Other Environmental Non-Environmental	3	as w 13A/171
C =	34		

Total Score = A x B x C = 756

OK

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 154
OU No 17

Evaluation Date 2/16/94
Evaluators AWS

RX-TIVE METAL SITES

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	met
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1	1
		A = <u>3</u>	
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u> =
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	<u>5</u>	No Cut
Technology	Needs New Tools, "off the shelf"	<u>5</u>	
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	<u>5</u>	
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Listed	<u>5</u>	
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	<u>5</u>	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	<u>5</u>	
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No waste	<u>5</u>	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	HTB Concerned HTB Unconcerned	<u>5</u>	
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	<u>5</u>	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	<u>5</u>	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact	<u>5</u>	1
Other Factors	Does Not Impact Affects Impact	<u>5</u>	Does it
		C = <u>50</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 300

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 148
OU No 13

Evaluation Date 2/8/99
Evaluators AWS

Waste Leaks

EVALUATION FACTORS		SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	Buried
Current Environmental Quality	Appropriate Quality Poor Quality	3	unknown
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	2	"
A =		7	
Representativeness of Data	Representative Inferior	1	C
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	3	Med an
Technology	Needs New Tools "Off the Shelf"	2	Sample
Implementability	Easy Implement No Implement	1	USC/utlts/nu use
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	1	-
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	3	Med an
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	3	Med an
Ease of Waste Disposal	No waste	3	Likely New Party
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	NTB Cooperative NTB Variants	1	Likely
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Policy Acceptable	1	DAD
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	Yes No	1	DAD
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Lower Negative Impact Higher No Negative Impact	3	Median
Other Factors	Other Assessment Assessments	1	DAD
C =		26	

Total Score = A x B x C = 182

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 152
OU No 13

Evaluation Date 2/18/04
Evaluators HKS

TK 221 4, 16

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 TK
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	3 probably of good
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	3
A =	7	
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	B = 1 UTK Construction
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	1 TK
Technology	Needs New Tools "Off the Shelf"	2 while TK is in use
Implementability	Easy Implement No Changes	1 in use
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	1 -
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	1 -
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	3 median
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No Waste	4 straightforward
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Commitment Low Commitment	1 UKL
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	1 DAD
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	Yes No	1 DAD
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Lesser Negative Impact Greater Negative Impact	3 median
Other Factors	Other Environmental Assessments	1 DAD
C =	21	

Total Score = A x B x C = 147

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1571
 OU No 13

Evaluation Date AIC
 Evaluators 2/18/94

R&D site North

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	(<i>Traversed daily</i>)
Current Environmental Quality	Excellent Quality Poor Quality	(<i>1</i>)
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	(<i>1</i>)
A =	2	
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	B = 1 <i>new - hr = .2</i>
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Flexible Somewhat Flexible	4 <i>Same as - same UBC</i>
Technology	Needs New Tools, "Off the Shelf"	(<i>1</i>)
Implementability	Easy Changes No Changes	2 <i>UBC/UCh</i>
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	2 <i>a - 1</i>
Worker Safety	High Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	4 <i>may use utl pross</i>
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	3 <i>Med an</i>
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Mixed No Waste	3 <i>Median - can't be HJ</i>
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	MTR Concerned MTP Concerned	1 <i>WLM</i>
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	1 <i>D+D</i>
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1 <i>D+D</i>
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact	3 <i>Med an</i>
Other Factors	Doesn't Contribute Contributes	1 <i>D+D</i>
C =	30	

Total Score = A x B x C = 360

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 158
OU No 13

Evaluation Date 2/18/04
Evaluators ANS

RAD site 551

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	Banned
Current Environmental Quality	1	Cleaned up
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	1	Cut a wide case 53C
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	3	UBC?
Technology	5	Saving
Implementability	1	Util/UBC
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	
Worker Safety	3	Median
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	Med -
Ease of Waste Disposal	3	MW?
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1	Wacky
Public and Agency Acceptability	1	DAD
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	DAD
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	3	Median
Other Factors	1	DAD
C =	26	

Total Score = A x B x C = 312

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 169
OU No 13

Evaluation Date 3/16/94
Evaluators KCS

$H_2O_2 \approx 0.1$

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1	
	A =	7	
Representativeness of Data	Inadequate Sufficient	B =	5
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5	
Technology	Needs New Tools, "off the Shelf"	4	
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5	
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	5	
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	5	
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Waste	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	High Commitment S - RPP Workers	4	
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	5	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact	5	
Other Factors	Other Assessment Assessment	5	
	C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 700

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 171
OU No 13

Evaluation Date 2/18/94
Evaluators AIC

Five Years

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	Hired
Current Environmental Quality	1	From Evaluation
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	No cont
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	1	No cont
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	No cont
Technology	1	"on the spot"
Implementability	5	Util / 335 URC
Design/Implementation Schedule	5	1 1
Worker Safety	5	No cont
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	1	No waste
Ease of Waste Disposal	5	1 1
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	Maybe
Public and Agency Acceptability	5	No big deal
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	5	strong - dep't on 138/1st
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	1
Other Factors	5	do it
C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 910

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 196OU No 13VV 11,12,13Evaluation Date 2/12/04Evaluators AJS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	burned
Current Environmental Quality	3	median
Potential for Contaminant Migration	3	
A =	7	
Representativeness of Data	4	need ~ 7 wk
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	Sampling
Technology	2	
Implementability	1	utls/in use / general
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	
Worker Safety	3	median
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	Median
Ease of Waste Disposal	3	pcss b/c MW
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	1	likely
Public and Agency Acceptability	1	D+D
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	DAD
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	3	median
Other Factors	1	D+D
C =	28	

Total Score = A x B x C = 784

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 190
OU No 13

Evaluation Date 2/16/97
Evaluators A/Cs

Cassie Cook

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	cleaned up - Cassie
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Good Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	
	A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accurate	5	cleaned up
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Stagnant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Flexible	1	
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs New Tools <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> "Off the Shelf"	1	cleaned up
Implementability	<input type="checkbox"/> Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles	1	
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Long Lead <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-Timed	5	
Worker Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to Worker	1	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> High Volume of waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of waste	1	
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Difficult <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No issue	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Cooperative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Cooperative	1	
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well-Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fully Accepted	5	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	1	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Leaves Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leaves No Negative Impact	5	
Other Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not contribute <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adds to Responsibility	5	
	C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 191
OU No 13

H₂O₂ leak

Evaluation Date 2/12/04
Evaluators AS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential		<i>Same as 169</i>
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality		
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential		
	A =		
Representativeness of Data	Representative Inconclusive	B =	
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Short-Sighted & Very Pessimistic		
Technology	Needs New Tools, "off the shelf"		
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles		
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead		
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker		
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste		
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Waste		
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	Very Conservative & Very Workers		
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not well Accepted Fully Accepted		
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes		
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact		
Other Factors	Other Assessments		
	C =		

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 197
OU No 10713

Evaluation Date 2/22/84
Evaluators AC's

Scrap Metal

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	3
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	4
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	3
A =	10	
Representativeness of Data	<u>Indeterminate</u> <u>Indeterminate</u>	B = 3
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	1
Technology	Needs New Tools "Off the Shelf"	3
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	3
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Term	2
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	3
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	-
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRUE No waste	1
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	High Commitment Low Commitment	1
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Policy Accepted	3
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	Yes No	1
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5
Other Factors	• <u>Lower Assessment</u> • <u>Higher Assessment</u>	5
C =	31	

Total Score = A x B x C = 930

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 131OU No 14

RAD SITE #1 700 Area

Evaluation Date 2/18/94Evaluators MCS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	traversed daily
Current Environmental Quality	3	probable
Potential for Contaminant Migration	3	-
A =	7	
Representativeness of Data	3	Median
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	1	nd cleanup
Technology	4	nd cleanup
Implementability	1	-
Design/Implementation Schedule	1	DID / In use / PA / util
Worker Safety	3	Median
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	Median
Ease of Waste Disposal	2	bad
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	3	Mix
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	Median
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	DID
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	3	Median
Other Factors	1	DID
C =	26	

Total Score = A x B x C = 546

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1561
OU No 14

334 PKG lot

Evaluation Date 2/15/84
Evaluators A/S

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 <i>banned</i>
Current Environmental Quality	Good Quality Poor Quality	2
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	2
A =	5	
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	B = — <i>as</i> — <i>as</i> — <i>as</i>
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	3
Technology	Needs New Tools "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	1
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	1
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	5
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No Waste	3
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	Not Cooperative Cooperative	1
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	1
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	• •	1
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Large Negative Impact No Negative Impact	3
Other Factors	Major Determinant Minor Determinant	1
C =	32	

Total Score = A x B x C = 640

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 160
OU No 14

and site 444 Pkg lot

Evaluation Date 2/16/94
Evaluators AICS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1
Current Environmental Quality	Good Quality Poor Quality	2
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	2
A =		5
Representativeness of Data	Good Data Bad Data	1
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	3
Technology	From New Tech "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	1
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	1
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	Very Conservative Very Liberal	1
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	1
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact	3
Other Factors	Outer Responsibility = - Associate Responsibility	1
C =		32

Total Score = A x B x C = (640)

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 161
OU No 14

Evaluation Date 2/15/94
Evaluators AWS

PM at W of 664

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	()
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	2
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	2
A =		5
Representativeness of Data	Representative Unrepresentative	B = 4
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	3
Technology	Needs New Tools "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	1
Worker Safety	High Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	5
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No Waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	100% Consistent = 100% Workers	1
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not all-Business Fully accepted	1
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	Yes No	1
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	3
Other Factors	Other Assessment Assessments	1
C =		32

Total Score = A x B x C = 1.40

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 162
OU No 1A

Evaluation Date 2/1/84
Evaluators A/S

PLT 9 He + 2 700 acre

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	Cleaned up
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1	
	A =	<u>3</u>	
Representativeness of Data	Inadequate ufficient	1	
	B =	<u>1</u>	
REMEDIALION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific & Very Plastic	5	
Technology	Needs New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	1	
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5	
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	1	
Worker Safety	Risk to worker Low Risk to worker	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	1	
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU WASTE No waste	1	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	XIS Consistent NPP Consistent	5	
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	5	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	#	5	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Large Negative Impact Large No Negative Impact	5	
Other Factors	Other Environmental Non-Environmental	1	
	C =	<u>66</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1641
OU No A4

Evaluation Date 2/12/94
Evaluators MKS

R&D site - concrete slab

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	As planned
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	
	A =	<u>3</u>	
Representativeness of Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Unrepresentative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Representative	-	
	B =	-	
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Site-Specific <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Flexible	1	
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs New Tools <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> "Off the Shelf"	1	
Implementability	<input type="checkbox"/> Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles	1	
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Long Lead <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-Timed	1	
Worker Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to Worker	1	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> High Volume of Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of Waste	1	
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> TRU Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Waste	1	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Consistent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WTP Criteria	1	
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well-Received <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fully Accepted	1	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	1	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Causes Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Causes No Negative Impact	1	
Other Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Adverse Implications <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Positive Implications	1	
	C =	<u>60</u>	

Total Score = A x B x C = 90

IHSS No 164 2
OU No 14

IHSS Evaluation Form

Evaluation Date 2/14/94
Evaluators AICs

Reg sit 886 Sp 16

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1 <i>Cleaned up</i>
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1 <i>1</i>
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1
A =		5
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	5 <i>B =</i>
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Slow-Spoke Very Flexible	5
Technology	Needs New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	5
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	5
Worker Safety	Not in Hazard Low Risk to Worker	5
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	-
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRUE Disposal No waste	5
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	100% Caucasian 85% Hispanic	5
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Received Fully Accepted	5
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact - Creates No Negative Impact	5
Other Factors	Other Assessment Alternative Assessment	5
C =		60

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 1643
OU No 14

R&D site E&T plan

Evaluation Date 2/18/94
Evaluators AICs

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	Traversed regularly
Current Environmental Quality	2	"u - m"
Potential for Contaminant Migration	2	
A =	C	
Representativeness of Data	A	real & w. 12
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	Sample
Technology	5	
Implementability	3	Wd m - V.T.LC / Payment
Design/Implementation Schedule	3	
Worker Safety	5	probably
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	5	if any
Ease of Waste Disposal	5	not likely
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	maybe
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	what's being accomplished
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	3	D&D
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	maybe
Other Factors	3	Median
C =	50	

Total Score = A x B x C = 1000

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 178
OU No 15

881 Drum Sts Area

Evaluation Date 2/22/94
Evaluators NLS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	Protected area w/ 20' bags
Current Environmental Quality	1	No detected spills
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	Inside buildings
A =	2	
Representativeness of Data	B = 1	1.22 - no Scoring
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	Cleanups
Technology	5	off site - RCRA & Superfund
Implementability	3	in use
Design/Implementation Schedule	3	need to plan waste generation
Worker Safety	5	trained daily
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	5	6161
Ease of Waste Disposal	5	maybe
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	Likely
Public and Agency Acceptability	1	Where will waste go?
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	D&D - FEBI
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	minimize Blg
Other Factors	1	tell no longer needed
C =	44	

Total Score = A x B x C = 660

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 179
OU No 15

865 Durst area

Evaluation Date 2/22/04
Evaluators AIC

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	Protected area inside Building
Current Environmental Quality	1	No Local Complaints
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	inside Building
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	1	Local sample
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	5	flexible
Technology	5	at - 2 C.R.A closure plan
Implementability	-	in use
Design/Implementation Schedule	3	rec + sto waste somewhere
Worker Safety	5	no need activity
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	5	likely
Ease of Waste Disposal	5	maybe
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	likely
Public and Agency Acceptability	1	where will waste go?
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	DID of 865
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	inside Building
Other Factors	1	till no longer needed
C =	44	

$$\text{Total Score} = A \times B \times C = 660$$

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 120
OU No 15

Evaluation Date 2/22/94
Evaluators AKS

883 Dunn St Area

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	Same reasons as 178
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	
A =	3		
Representativeness of Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Uncertain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Probable	<input type="checkbox"/> B = 5	
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Slow-Slow <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Flexible		
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs New Tools <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> "Off the Shelf"		
Implementability	<input type="checkbox"/> Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles		
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Long Long <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-Long		
Worker Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to Worker		
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> High Volume of Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of Waste		
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> TRU Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Waste		
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="checkbox"/> NED Contract <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPP Workers		
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well-Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fully Accepted		
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Causes Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Causes No Negative Impact		
Other Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Additional Information		
C =	44		

Total Score = A x B x C = 660

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 204
OU No KS

Urban Clay Rochester

Evaluation Date 2/22/94
Evaluators AKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	Protected Area - In-Site Building
Current Environmental Quality	1	No DOLT Spills
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	Inside Building
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	5	All CM Samples
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	3	Q dismantled
Technology	5	RCRA Closure Plan
Implementability	3	RAD
Design/Implementation Schedule	3	Regulatory strictures
Worker Safety	3	RAD? (776 ASRF?)
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	?
Ease of Waste Disposal	2	maybe
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	776 ASRF / Cleaning of room
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	Median
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	DID f 497
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	In-Site Building
Other Factors	1	use in remediation of 108?
C =	37	

Total Score = A x B x C = 555

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 211
OU No 15

EDI Dcme Sts

Evaluation Date 2/22/94
Evaluators AES

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	<i>Same score as 178</i>
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1	
		<i>A =</i>	1
Representativeness of Data	Inadequate Sufficient	B =	5
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5	
Technology	Needs New Tools, "Off the Shelf"	1	
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	3	
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short Lead	3	
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to worker	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	5	
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No waste	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	HHS Government HHS Workers	5	
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Respected Fully Accepted	1	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Lesser Negative Impact Larger Negative Impact	5	
Other Factors	Deter Determinants Assume Determinants	1	
		<i>C =</i>	44

Total Score = A x B x C = 660

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 217
OU No 5Evaluation Date 2/22/94
Evaluators AICE81 CN Bench Scale

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	1	inside building
Current Environmental Quality	1	1
Potential for Contaminant Migration	1	
A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	5	out samples
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	3	4 dismantled
Technology	5	RCRA Closure Plan
Implementability	3	Regulatory restrictions
Design/Implementation Schedule	3	" "
Worker Safety	3	776 ASRF
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	3	Moderate
Ease of Waste Disposal	4	straight bag?
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	5	Likely
Public and Agency Acceptability	3	why don't?
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	1	DID of E81
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	5	inside building
Other Factors	1	DID of E81
C =	37	

Total Score = A x B x C = 585

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No. _____
OU No. _____

Evaluation Date 2/22/94
Evaluators MKS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential		
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor Quality		
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential		
	A =		
Representativeness of Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate		
	B =		
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Slow—Operate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Flexible		
Technology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Modern New Tech. <input type="checkbox"/> "Out of the Stone"		
Implementability	<input type="checkbox"/> Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles		
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Long Lead <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short-Lead		
Worker Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to Worker		
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> High Volume of Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of Waste		
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> TRU Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Waste		
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WFO Commitment <input type="checkbox"/> FWP Workers		
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well—Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fully Accepted		
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Lesser Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lesser No Negative Impact		
Other Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Implications <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable Implications		
	C =		

Total Score = A x B x C = _____

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No. _____
 OU No. _____ 15

Evaluation Date _____
 Evaluators _____

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION
SAFETY		
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	
A =		
Representativeness of Data	Unrepresentative Representative	
B =		
REMEDIATION		
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	
Technology	Needs New Tech. "Off the shelf"	
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Waste Generation	High Volume of waste Low Volume of waste	
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Waste	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Work Force	100% Government 5 - 50% Workers	
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	
BENEFICIAL USE		
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Environmental Impact	Lessons Negative Impact = Lessons No Negative Impact	
Other Factors	Other Information Assessments Information	
C =		

Total Score = A x B x C = _____

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 192
OU No 10

Evaluation Date 2/22/97
Evaluators AICS

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	<i>In Progress --</i>
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1	<i>NFA</i>
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1	
		A = 3	
Representativeness of Data	Insufficient Sufficient	1	
			B = 1
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	1	
Technology	Needs New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	1	
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	1	
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	1	
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	1	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	1	
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Hazard No hazard	1	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	ESD Concerned ESD Unconcerned	1	
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	1	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	1	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Creates Negative Impact Creates No Negative Impact	1	
Other Factors	Only Ameliorative Ameliorative	1	
		C = 60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900
NFA

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 185
OU No 16

Solvent Spill

Evaluation Date 2/22/04
Evaluators AIC

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	In Progress as an NTA
Current Environmental Quality	Average Quality Poor Quality	1	
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1	
	A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	Incomplete Incomplete	5	
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5	
Technology	Needs More Tools "off the shelf"	5	
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5	
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term Short-Term	5	
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker - Low Risk to Worker	5	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	5	
Ease of Waste Disposal	TRU Waste No waste	5	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	IWS Cooperative IWP Vertical	5	
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	5	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact Leaves No Negative Impact	5	
Other Factors	Deter Determinants Assessors Determinants	5	
	C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 60

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 194
OU No 16

Evaluation Date 2/22/04
Evaluators ATCS

Steam Condensate leak

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	Low Potential High Potential	1	/ NFA
Current Environmental Quality	Acceptable Quality Poor Quality	1	/ (in progress)
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential High Potential	1	/
A =	3	/	
Representativeness of Data	Excellent Fair	5	/
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	Very Site-Specific Very Flexible	5	/
Technology	From New Tech. "Off the Shelf"	5	/
Implementability	Many Obstacles No Obstacles	5	/
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Lead Short-Lead	5	/
Worker Safety	Risk to Worker Low Risk to Worker	5	/
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste Low Volume of Waste	5	/
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult No Hassle	5	/
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	High Compromises Low Compromises	5	/
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted Fully Accepted	5	/
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	No Yes	5	/
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	Large Negative Impact Large No Negative Impact	5	/
Other Factors	Major Barrier Minor Barrier	5	/
C =	10		

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 143
OU No 16

Evaluation Date 2/22/94
Evaluators AKC

Steam Condensate

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	In Progress as
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor Quality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good Quality	1	NFA
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Potential	1	
	A =	3	
Representativeness of Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Average <input type="checkbox"/> Good	1	
	B =	1	
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Flexible <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Flexible	5	
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs New Tools <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Off the Shelf	1	
Implementability	<input type="checkbox"/> Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Obstacles	1	
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Long Lead <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Short Lead	1	
Worker Safety	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Risk to Worker	1	
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="checkbox"/> High Volume of Waste <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Volume of Waste	1	
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/> TRS Required <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No TRS	1	
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well-Respected <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Highly Respected	1	
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Well-Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Highly Accepted	1	
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	1	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Causes Negative Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Causes No Negative Impact	1	
Other Factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment Done	1	
	C =	60	

Total Score = A x B x C = 900
NFA

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No 195
OU No 16

Nickel Caribou L

Evaluation Date 2/22/94
Evaluators AES

EVALUATION FACTORS		SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY				
Exposure Potential	Low Potential / High Potential	1		In Progress
Current Environmental Quality	Appropriate Quality / Poor Quality	1		as NFA
Potential for Contaminant Migration	Low Potential / High Potential	1		
A =		3		
Representativeness of Data	Highly Representative / Not Representative	B =		5
REMEDIATION				
Flexibility	Very Short-Sighted / Very Forward	5		
Technology	Needs New York / Off the Shelf	5		
Implementability	Many Obstacles / No Obstacles	5		
Design/Implementation Schedule	Long Term / Short-Term	5		
Worker Safety	High Risk to Worker / Low Risk to Worker	5		
WASTE MANAGEMENT				
Waste Generation	High Volume of Waste / Low Volume of Waste	5		
Ease of Waste Disposal	Very Difficult / No Waste	5		
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY				
Work Force	High Commitment / Low Commitment	5		
Public and Agency Acceptability	Not Well-Accepted / Fully Accepted	5		
BENEFICIAL USE				
Achieves Final Resolution	No / Yes	5		
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY				
Environmental Impact	Leaves Negative Impact / Leaves No Negative Impact	5		
Other Factors	Only Environmental / Environmental & Economic	5		
C =		60		

Total Score = A x B x C = 900

NFA

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No _____
 OU No _____

Evaluation Date _____
 Evaluators _____

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Low Potential <input type="radio"/> High Potential		
Current Environmental Quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Good Quality <input type="radio"/> Poor Quality		
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Low Potential <input type="radio"/> High Potential		
	A =		
Representativeness of Data	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Excellent <input type="radio"/> Satisfactory <input type="radio"/> Fair <input type="radio"/> Poor		
	B =		
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Very Flexible <input type="radio"/> Flexible <input type="radio"/> Moderate <input type="radio"/> Limited <input type="radio"/> Not Flexible		
Technology	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Modern State-of-the-Art <input type="radio"/> "Off the Shelf"		
Implementability	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Many Options <input type="radio"/> Some Options <input type="radio"/> Few Options <input type="radio"/> No Options		
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Long Term <input type="radio"/> Short-Term		
Worker Safety	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Risk to Worker <input type="radio"/> Low Risk to Worker		
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input checked="" type="radio"/> High Volume of waste <input type="radio"/> Low Volume of waste		
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input checked="" type="radio"/> TRU Waste <input type="radio"/> No Waste		
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input checked="" type="radio"/> WFO Compliant <input type="radio"/> WFO Warning		
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Well-Received <input type="radio"/> Fairly Accepted		
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No		
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Major Negative Impact <input type="radio"/> Minor Negative Impact		
Other Factors	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Major Factor <input type="radio"/> Minor Factor		
	C =		

Total Score = A x B x C = _____

IHSS Evaluation Form

IHSS No _____
 OU No _____

Evaluation Date _____
 Evaluators _____

EVALUATION FACTORS	SCORE (1 through 5)	JUSTIFICATION	
SAFETY			
Exposure Potential	<input type="radio"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="radio"/> High Potential		
Current Environmental Quality	<input type="radio"/> Acceptable Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Poor Quality		
Potential for Contaminant Migration	<input type="radio"/> Low Potential <input checked="" type="radio"/> High Potential		
A =			
Representativeness of Data	<input type="radio"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="radio"/> Good <input type="radio"/> Fair <input type="radio"/> Poor		
B =			
REMEDIATION			
Flexibility	<input type="radio"/> Very Site-Specific <input checked="" type="radio"/> Very Flexible		
Technology	<input type="radio"/> Needs New Tools <input checked="" type="radio"/> "Off the Shelf"		
Implementability	<input type="radio"/> Many Obstacles <input checked="" type="radio"/> No Obstacles		
Design/Implementation Schedule	<input type="radio"/> Long Lead <input checked="" type="radio"/> Short-Lead		
Worker Safety	<input type="radio"/> Risk to Worker <input checked="" type="radio"/> Low Risk to Worker		
WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Waste Generation	<input type="radio"/> High Volume of Waste <input checked="" type="radio"/> Low Volume of Waste		
Ease of Waste Disposal	<input type="radio"/> TRU Waste <input checked="" type="radio"/> Non-TRU Waste		
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Work Force	<input type="radio"/> Not Well-Respected <input checked="" type="radio"/> Highly Respected		
Public and Agency Acceptability	<input type="radio"/> Not Well-Accepted <input checked="" type="radio"/> Highly Accepted		
BENEFICIAL USE			
Achieves Final Resolution	<input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes		
ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY			
Environmental Impact	<input type="radio"/> Causes Negative Impact <input checked="" type="radio"/> Causes No Negative Impact		
Other Factors	<input type="radio"/> Poor Assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> Accurate Assessment		
C =			

Total Score = A x B x C = _____